DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 196 555 PS 011 918

AUTHOR Gray, Wendy
TITLE Day Care as a Social Service Strategy: 1890 to 1946. A Substantive Paper.
PUB DATE Nov 79
NOTE 136p.: Ph.D. Dissertation, Brandeis Univeristy.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Agency Role: *Day Care: Foster Family: Social Change: *Social History: *Social Influences: Social Problems: *Social Work: Student Research

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this paper is to examine the impact of the social work profession on day care delivery from 1890 to 1946, and to relate the outcomes of the investigation to some contemporary social policy issues. The first chapter discusses day care during the Progressive Era (1890 to 1918) while the second chapter explores the "professionalization" of the day nursery from 1919 to 1930. Chapter three focuses on day care delivery during the depression years (1931 to 1939). The development of "foster family day care homes" during this period is explored in detail and the developing concern for the "mental hygiene" of children in the day nursery is discussed. The fourth chapter evaluates persistently neglected issues in the history of day care, this time in the context of the World War II era. The initial negative reaction of social workers to mothers entering the labor force is depicted in this chapter. The final chapter summarizes all of these themes in the context of the conflicting social policy goals surrounding current day care services. In addition, the role of social services is evaluated according to the options presented in the revised draft of the 1979 Health, Education, and Welfare Day Care Regulations. Supporting documentation concerning research on day nurseries from 1919 to 1929, federal policy on day care services during World War I and the depression years, and day care services during World War II is included in three appendices. (Author/RH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED196555

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

DAY CARE AS A SOCIAL SERVICE STRATEGY:
1890 TO 1946

A Substantive Paper

Presented to
The Faculty of the Florence Heller Graduate
School for Advanced Studies in
Social Welfare

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements of the
Degree Doctor of Philosophy

Wendy Gray
November, 1979

PS011918

Copyright 1980

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Wendy Gray

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Wellesley
College
Center for
Research on
Women

Wellesley College
828 Washington Street
Wellesley, Massachusetts 02181
Telephone: (617) 235-6360, 235-0320
Cable: WELLRESCTR

In cooperation with
The Higher Education Resource Services and
The Federation of Organizations
for Professional Women

ABSTRACT

Day Care as a Social Service Strategy: 1890 to 1946

Wendy Gray, Ph.D. Candidate

Heller Graduate School for Advanced Studies
in Social Welfare
Brandeis University
Waltham, Massachusetts 02254

and
Field Research Associate
School-Age Child Care Project
Wellesley College Center for Research on Women
Wellesley, Massachusetts 02181

Both as a political symbol and as a substantive program, day care services have generated more than a century of controversy, conflict, and compromise in the social work profession. Yet the nature of the relationship between the social work profession and the delivery of day care services has not been systematically explored in its historical context. The purpose of this paper is to examine the impact of the social work profession on day care delivery from 1890 to 1946, and to relate this to some contemporary social policy issues.

One intriguing discovery is that the utilization of day care as a social service strategy has been going on for nearly a century. From a historical perspective, day care as a "social service strategy" meant that the social work profession utilized such services as a tool for intervention into low-income households with working mothers or with families in similarly "unfortunate circumstances." This type of intervention began during the late nineteenth century under the auspices of charity organization societies as well as settlement houses. While each group had a different interpretation of the "causes" of maternal employment, as well as the negative "consequences," both groups sought to help such families by providing day care services. However, as social service delivery became increasingly professionalized in the early twentieth century, the day care center was used as an "appropriate setting" in which social workers could define as well as expand their unique professional contributions.

The paper is divided into four major chapters. The first chapter discusses day care during the Progressive Era, 1890 to 1918. Charity organization societies and settlement houses are evaluated in terms of their ideological contributions to day care. In addition, the "proper place" of mothers in society is analyzed as it relates to employment. The final section explores the emergence of the social work profession as a loose confederation of these two groups and its impact on day care delivery.

The second chapter explores the "professionalization" of the day nursery from 1919 to 1930. The first two sections of this chapter analyze the discussions at the 1919 White House Conference on Children and the 1919 National Conference on Social Work. The third section addresses the incorporation of preschool education into the day nursery as a way to ensure its future and to further professionalize such services. The fourth section evaluates the factors associated with the increase in number of day nurseries by 1930, the professionalization of day nursery staff, and the evolution of other forms of early childhood intervention: nursery schools, relief nursery schools, and play schools. These early childhood programs were important to day care services because they provided sources of contrast for service delivery and created social class distinctions among the various early childhood programs.

Chapter three focuses on day care delivery during the Depression years, 1931 to 1939. Rather than examining the government role in the expansion of day care services (which is discussed in an appendix), this chapter looks at previously neglected issues in the history of day care. The development of "foster family day care homes" is explored in detail. In addition, the concern for the "mental hygiene" of the children in the day nursery is discussed. Finally, some persistent themes in social work practice are discussed, such as initial diagnosis and assessment of families, continual casework evaluation, mothers' meetings, and similar issues.

The fourth chapter also evaluates persistently neglected issues in the history of day care, this time in the context of the World War II era. (Once again, a discussion of the governmental role during these years is included in an appendix.) This chapter demonstrates the initial negative reaction of social workers to mothers entering the labor force in such unprecedented numbers during the war effort. Eventually, social workers were supportive of day care centers only because it symbolized their concern for the welfare of children of working mothers rather than condoning maternal employment. Indeed, social workers were ultimately responsible for de-stigmatizing day care as "charity," so that working mothers would use the services instead of making haphazard--yet non-stigmatized--arrangements.

The final chapter summarizes all of these themes in the context of the conflicting social policy goals for current day care services. In addition, the role of social services is evaluated according to the options presented in the revised draft of the 1979 Health, Education, and Welfare Day Care Regulations.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Introduction 1

Chapter 1 - Day Care During the Progressive Era, 1890 to 1918 10

Chapter 2 - The Professionalization of the Day Nursery, 1919 to 1930 35

Chapter 3 - Day Care During the Depression Years, 1931 to 1940 53

Chapter 4 - Day Care and World War II, 1940 to 1946. . . 68

Summary and Conclusions 80

Appendices 90

Bibliography 115

INTRODUCTION

Both as a political symbol and as a substantive program, day care services have generated more than a century of controversy, conflict, and compromise in the social work profession. However, the nature of the relationship between the social work profession and the delivery of day care services[1] has not been systematically explored in its historical context. The purpose of this paper is to closely examine the impact of the social work profession on day care delivery from 1890 to 1946.[2]

Not only does this issue have historical significance for the study of day care, but also has contemporary social policy implications. The June, 1979 draft of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare's regulations for day care contains a section on social services. (45 CFR 71.20, 71.60). In these guidelines,[3] two options are presented for the provision of social services by the day care center as well as the state welfare department. One option for the day care center is to provide families with information and referral to social service agencies in the community. The second option is not only to provide information and referral but also to actually assist parents in obtaining social services and to provide follow-up of cases to ensure service delivery. On the state level, two options are also presented in the proposed regulations. One possibility is for the State to provide information to the parents using day care on how to obtain various social services. The second possibility is to require the state to establish "links" with the day care center to ensure that children eligible for federal, state or local social services are receiving them when needed.

---

[1] For the purposes of this paper, "day care" and "day nursery" mean providing care for children under the age of six in a special building or portion of a building. Historically, most mothers who used day care centers were full-time labor force participants.

[2] Both primary and secondary data were used for this paper. Primary sources include articles from the National Conference on Charities, later renamed the National Conference of Social Work. The following journals were also used: The Survey, Social Service Review, Child Welfare League of America's Bulletin, Social Work, and The Family, later renamed Social Casework.

[3] These federal guidelines do not affect all day care centers, but rather those centers in which the federal government provides funding for some of the children. The majority of funding for day care comes through Title XX of the Social Security Act.

The inclusion of social services in day care is controversial for two major reasons. One issue is that the role of social services would be minimized as compared to the existing regulations. Previously, social services were seen as an essential component for two major reasons:

> Counseling and guidance must be available to the family to help it determine the appropriateness of day care, the best facility for a particular child, and the possibility of alternative plans for care. The staff must also develop effective programs of referral to additional resources which meet family needs.
>
> Continuing assessment must be made with the parents of the child's adjustment in the day care program and of the family situation. (45 CFR 71.15)

The regulations further stated that such services were to be provided by a trained staff member in the day care center. The new proposal appears to limit the need for social services, even if the most inclusive option was adopted.

Secondly, the cost of social services is a controversial issue. In the "Regulatory Analysis" of the proposed guidelines, cost of providing social services could not be computed on a nationwide basis because expenditures are subject to state budget decisions on Title XX. Furthermore, the "Regulatory Analysis" recommended against the provision of social services because it would duplicate existing programs and would increase the federal reimbursement rate significantly. However, the report stated that the day care center might want to provide social services on a voluntary basis. (U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1979.)

One of the major problems of the proposed guidelines as well as the "Regulatory Analysis" is that they do not acknowledge the many reasons why day care services are used. By contemporary definition, day care is a "social utility" used by mothers who are working, enrolled in school, or in a job-training program. While employment for mothers of young children is still a source of controversy (Fraiberg, 1977), the actual numbers challenge such an ideology. Currently, the labor force participation rate of mothers with children under age six is 44 percent. In 1978, there were 18,300 day care centers nationwide serving approximately 900,000 children. Major funding for day care essentially comes from Title XX as well as the Child Care Tax Credit. Smaller funding sources include the Work Expense Allowance Program through Aid to Families with Dependent Children, the Work Incentive Program, and the Community Development Block Grant Entitlement Program through the Department of Housing and Urban Development. In addition, the Department of Agriculture provides funds to subsidize breakfast and lunch programs in day care centers. (Congressional Budget Office, 1978: 7, 24-25).

Nevertheless, the working mother has been viewed as an anomaly according to the "dominant American ideology." Remaining within the constraints of that ideology, many social workers have defined day care as a child welfare service rather than as a social utility. A perfect example of the social work perspective is presented by Alfred Kadushin, a nationally prominent child welfare expert. According to Kadushin (1974: 335):

> ...Day care is a supplementary child welfare service employed when family care for the child must be supplemented for some part of the day. The use of such supplementation is designed to permit the child to be maintained in his own home... Day care is primarily concerned with helping the temporarily motherless family--motherless because the mother is enacting the role of the employee.

Kadushin's definition implies several value-ladened issues. First, it implies that if day care was unavailable, children of working mothers would have to be removed from their homes so that they might receive constant maternal care from a foster mother or an adoptive mother. Secondly, Kadushin's definition implies that the roles of employee and mother are mutually exclusive. Further, the family that is rendered "temporarily motherless" implies that the family is most unfortunate.

The problem with Kadushin's conceptualization of day care as a child welfare service is that he relies on articles and books from the

1940's, 1950's, and early 1960's. According to the dominant American ideology of the post-war era, only mothers in "unfortunate circumstances" were "forced" to work, such as the woman who was suddenly widowed or whose spouse had a low income.[1] Consequently, such mothers might need the services of a caseworker to discuss such concerns. Even prior to entering the labor market, the caseworker might help the mother to readjust her budget as a way to avoid employment. (Kadushin, 1974: 362-3). This implies that if the woman worked it would be for "pin money" rather than financial necessity or a similarly valid reason. Further, the mother might be unnecessarily "abandoning" her child if she worked.

A caseworker at a day care center is also important because the mother may suffer from "inter-role conflict." As Kadushin (1974: 368) suggests, "The difficulties of doing justice to all of her responsibilities without feeling guilty or inadequate may require the opportunity for periodic discussions with a sympathetic, understanding person." In addition, some mothers may feel guilty about leaving the care of her child temporarily to others or fear that the child will lose affection for her. Lastly, Kadushin suggests that day care is an important institution for social work because it is a tool of intervention into the "problem family" who would not ordinarily seek out professional services to solve their problems. For all these reasons, a caseworker is a necessary staff person at the day care center.

---

[1] The attitude that mothers were forced to work because of "unfortunate circumstances" still prevails today. However, Florence Ruderman's study for the Child Welfare League of America (1968) was probably the first study to suggest that working mothers were not deviant. However, hints that day care was a social utility instead of a social service appeared in the late 1950's. As suggested by Henrietta Gordon in her Casework Services for Children (1956: 311):

> Perhaps one reason for the resistence or reluctance to consider day care as a social service is that the ever increasing number of working mothers of school age children make some people view the care of children away from their own homes as a normal pattern which requires no casework.

Kadushin (1974: 354-8) cites additional situations which require the special services of a social worker. For example, the day care center can be used as an alternative to institutionalizing children with mental, emotional, or physical handicaps. Secondly, there may be cases of disturbed parent-child relationships. Thirdly, day care can be used when the mother needs prolonged hospitalization, has died, or has deserted her family. Lastly, day care can be used as a remedial measure for a "seriously deprived" family.

Recent evidence of these four issues had been suggested by the National Study of Social Services to Children and Their Families. (Shyne & Schroeder, 1978).[1] In this study, it was discovered that of all the children in the study, approximately 16 percent (285,920 children) were in day care and had a non-working mother. This means that the children were referred to the day care center as a social service strategy rather than as a service to allow the mother to work. While the report suggests some basic reasons for referral to day care, these findings were not explored in further detail.

---

[1] This study gathered data on 1,787,000 children from 41 states and the District of Columbia. Of those children in day care, 84 percent were under age six and 12 percent were aged seven to eleven. The most frequent reason for recommending day care was financial need (51%) which could be equivalent to Kadushin's definition of "serious deprivation." Other important reasons for use of day care included: abuse of child (11%), emotional problems of parent (9%), child neglect (7%), and emotional problems of the child (5%). (Shyne & Schroder, 1978: 93).

In fact, an intriguing discovery is that the utilization of day care as a social service strategy has occurred for nearly a century. By "social service strategy" it is meant that the social work profession has utilized day care as a tool for intervention in low-income households with working mothers or with a family in other "unfortunate circumstances." This type of intervention began during the late nineteenth century under the auspices of charity organization societies as well as settlement houses. While each group had different interpretations of the "causes" of maternal employment, as well as the negatives "consequences," both groups sought to help such families.

At the same time, the existence of the day nursery generated a great deal of controversy during the late nineteenth century. Perhaps the most sensitive issue was that the day nursery symbolized the abdication of the woman's "proper place" in the home. According to the dominant American ideology, women belonged in the home as guardians of democratic values and educators of future generations. In effect, the existence of day nurseries was seen as a threat to the maternal role in society.

The intent of this paper is to examine several major themes in day care as they evolved from 1890 to 1946. As a social service strategy, day care services were developed as an institutionalized response to the needs of working mothers. However, in the decades to follow, day care was advocated for many diverse reasons. Furthermore, social workers utilized the day nurseries as an avenue to define and expand their unique professional skills. Essentially, social work services were espoused as a way to guarantee the future viability of the day nursery as an institution.

The second important theme of this paper is that changes occurred in social workers' attitudes toward maternal employment. In the late nineteenth century, the only mothers who sought employment came from low-income or "unfortunate" families. Mothers were not pursuing careers because they lacked the proper credentials, in addition to the social disapproval of maternal employment. However, employment of mothers from "unfortunate" circumstances was acceptable according to the dominant social welfare ideology. Not until 1911, with the introduction of Mothers' Pensions, was there a change in social welfare ideology: deserving mothers should remain at home with their children. Indeed, a negative attitude toward working mothers would remain constant in the profession, even through World War II. Symbolically, social workers could not support an institution which allowed mothers to work; such a position would have been contrary to the dominant American ideology and brand social workers as "radicals." Instead, the day nursery was espoused as a social service strategy designed to prevent the "neglect" of children of working mothers.

Consequently, families were viewed as "unfortunate" not only if the mother had to work but also if they were unable to arrange the preferred form of child care, which was through kith or kin. As a result, the day nursery was publically stigmatized as a form of charity rather than a social utility. Indeed, this negative attitude toward day care would prevail until the early 1940's. Attempts to de-stigmatize usage of day care would not occur until World War II, and initially would be opposed by the social work profession. Once again, support for day care was gained begrudgingly as social workers acknowledged that mothers were going to be employed, regardless of past social mores. Thus day care centers needed to be available lest inadequate arrangements be made for young children of working mothers.

CHAPTER 1

Day Care During the Progressive Era, 1890 to 1918

By 1910 there were approximately 450 day nurseries nationwide. (Steinfels, 1973: 34) What contributed to the growth of day nurseries and what were some of the ideological differences among the advocates and opponents? More specifically, how did the sponsors define and shape the goals and objectives of the day nurseries? Several factors are important to explore in detail: (1) the contributions of the charity organization movement and the settlement house movement, (2) the development of a state-sponsored pension program for low-income mothers and their children, and (3) the growing professionalization of social workers.

Before embarking upon a discussion of these three factors, it is important to examine two issues relevant to the social context during the 1890 to 1918 period. First, the demand for female labor had increased as many home industries were transferred to the factory. (Dewey, 1897; Whipple, 1929) In addition, wages from the factory were higher than income from home manufacture or the provision of lodging for boarders. During this period, female labor force participation had increased by about 25 percent. (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1975: 133) Secondly, increased immigration created the need for day nurseries since kin did not always accompany the family to America and were thus unavailable to provide child care. (Breakinridge, 1921)

However, the two most important forces behind the expansion of day care during the turn of the century were leaders from the charity organization movement as well as the settlement house movement. While seeking to help the poor, each group had different conceptualizations of the causes and alleviation of poverty. Essentially, the charity organization society supported the notion that individual defects and weaknesses led to poverty. Conversely, the reform leaders and settlement house workers stressed the external causations of poverty, such as economic depressions, underemployment of men, and discrimination against minority groups. While each group developed social welfare strategies to embody their ideology, both groups sponsored day nurseries. The following section compares and contrasts the motivation behind each group's support for day nurseries. The final section explores the emergence of the social work profession as a loose confederation of these two groups and the profession's subsequent influence on the delivery of day nursery services.

Charity Organization Movement. In response to what was considered sentimental, disorganized, and indiscriminate relief-giving, the leaders of the charity organization movement sought to develop a new methodology of helping the poor and unfortunate in the late 1870's. Rather than creating one additional charity fund, the leaders instead developed a "clearinghouse" for all charities in the community. Benevolence was thus redefined by the charity organization leaders as "intelligent, efficient service" to help the poor achieve self-sufficiency rather than as an activity for the wealthy to earn their place in heaven or to exercise their altruism. The new guidelines for helping the poor, or "scientific charity," emphasized a social investigation of each person, registration of all recipients, cooperation and coordination among charity groups, and the utilization of "friendly visitors." (Lubove, 1965; Trattner, 1974)

The "friendly visitor" was the most important person in the charity organization movement. Instead of merely providing alms to the poor, the friendly visitor would serve as a model citizen for the poor person to follow. Accordingly, the values the poor were to emulate included temperance, industriousness, frugality, foresight, moral restraint, and family cohesiveness. Rather than possessing any specific technical training or scientific understanding, the friendly visitor needed only to possess the strong moral constitution in order to help the poor.

Friendly visitors were also responsible for the social investigations of each person seeking charity. An individual in poverty was evaluated in the same manner that a physician would examine a patient and write a case history. In fact, granting relief without a thorough investigation was likened to a physician prescribing medicine without a diagnosis. (Lubove, 1965; Trattner, 1974)

Essentially, the purpose of the social investigation was to separate the "worthy" from the "unworthy" poor. Relief was thus granted to those worthy individuals who could not compete in the "ceaseless struggle for survival" such as the aged, infirm, sick or the orphaned child. Yet the test for worthiness of the poor mother was determined in a different manner.

Low-income mothers were classified as "worthy" by two major criteria. The first important criterion was that they were a widowed or deserted mother. Women whose husbands were considered intemperate, immoral, or slovenly were not eligible for charity because the family was poor as a result of the husband's misconduct. The second test of worthiness was the mother's willingness to work, however meaningless or dreary the task. The charity organization leaders felt that work prevented individuals from becoming morally perverse or dependent on charity.

Consequently, day nurseries were developed to embody two important principles of scientific charity. One important aspect of the day nursery was to provide "self-help" to mothers who demonstrated their worthiness through employment. A second important aspect was to provide care to "day orphans" which was the label applied to children of working mothers.

One example of achieving the first objective, the support to worthy mothers, was the Creche of the Buffalo Charity Organization Society. (Rosenau, 1886) Opened in 1880, this creche was operated in conjunction with a labor bureau which helped mothers find jobs as washerwomen, domestics, and launderesses. The creche and labor bureau were thus hailed as a new form of charity which emphasized "self-help" for the poor. As Rosenau (1886: 183) states, these forms of charity would make mothers "independent of alms" and would help break the cycle of poverty by caring for "a future generation (of children), self-reliant, cleanly, and thrifty, which will not require alms."

In accordance with the basic tenets of scientific charity, mothers were investigated to determine their length of residence in the city as well as the absence of a male breadwinner. Children were investigated to determine their legitimacy as well as to ensure that they were free from contagious diseases. However, Rosenau noted that many of the mothers were initially reluctant to use the creche. Perhaps many of the mothers were responding to the stigma of using a creche that was sponsored under charitable auspices. However, the veil of stigma would shroud day nursery utilization for decades to come.

The second goal of day nurseries was to provide care of "day orphans." Prior to the development of the day nursery, children of working mothers were often placed in orphanages along with other dependent and neglected children. This practice was begun during the Jacksonian era, when the solution to many social problems was institutionalization. Thus, an economically deprived person was sent to the almshouse. The insane person was sent to an asylum. A[illegible] the dependent or neglected child was usually sent to the orphanage. This type of institutionalization occurred with such frequency that charity organization workers in the 1870's and 1880's became concerned about the over-institutionalization of young children. In fact, relinquishing children to orphanages had become such a widespread practice that an investigation into such practices was recommended. A prominent charity organization leader, Josephine Shaw Lowell recommended that records from orphanages be closely examined so that children of working mothers could be "saved from the institution." (Dodge, 1912: 113-4) Thus an era of "child saving" schemes was introduced by reformers such as Charles Loring Brace and groups such as the Children's Aid Society and the National Conference of Charities and Corrections. (Lundberg, 1947; Steinfels, 1973)

Consequently, day nurseries were developed as a community effort to deinstitutionalize the care of children whose mothers were in the labor force. (Cahn & Bary, 1936; Lundberg, 1947; Steinfels, 1973) The primary purpose of the day nursery was to provide "day care of children who remain part of the family unit but for social or economic reasons cannot receive ordinary parental care." (Whipple, 1929: 87) Clearly, "ordinary parental care" was defined as full-time care by the child's mother.

At the same time that some children were being inappropriately placed in orphanages, there was reason to suspect that some children were not receiving adequate day care by kin, kith, or neighbors in the late nineteenth century. Sunley (1955: 155) states that it was not uncommon to discover that some working mothers drugged their children with laundanum to keep them passive during the day. Other children might be tied to a bedpost or left to the casual oversight of a neighbor or older sibling. (Steinfels, 1973: 41) Hence, the day nursery was seen as a "child protective" agency in that proper day care could be ensured for children of working mothers.

In addition to providing "self-help" to worthy working mothers and giving care to "day orphans," the day nursery was supported by many philanthropic matrons. (Greenblatt, 1977; Steinfels, 1973) Greenblatt (1977) argues that mothers with grown children, suffering essentially from a type of "underemployment," became involved with day nurseries as an extension of their maternal functions.

> Moreover, their action implied an intricate irony: They were upperclass women liberating themselves from complete domesticity, acting in the interests of lower-class women 'liberated' from the domestic life by economic necessity, and in the stated interest of a normative conception of the family that held women's place is in the home. (Greenblatt, 1977: 23-4)

Thus, it can be argued that these philanthropic matrons felt a "special calling" for their maternal knowledge and abilities.

Secondly, involvement in the day nurseries allowed such women to exercise a new avenue of power in providing charity. These wealthy matrons could attend board meetings, supervise the staff, plan fund-raising events, and cajole their peers into donating food, bedding, and toys. (Steinfels, 1973) In short, the day nursery provided these women with a more powerful role in administration that might have been accorded to them in most charity organizations which were run by men.

The Progressive Era and the Settlement House Movement. The late nineteenth century ushered in an era of increased industrialization, urbanization, and immigration. The plight of the urban and immigrant poor was given a new interpretation by social reformers: the environment needed restructuring rather than individuals. Hence the causes of poverty were attributed to the evils of industrialization[1] and urbanization; the low-income individual was seen as a "victim of circumstance." (Axinn & Levin, 1975; Davis, 1967) This represented a sharp departure from the charity organization movement which stressed individual causation of poverty.

---

[1] Prior to the emergence of unions, employment during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries was plagued by instability and exploitation. Employees worked in excess of 60 hours per week for low wages in unsanitary and unsafe factories. (Anthony, 1914: 22; Davis. 1967: 133).

The economic depression of 1893 represented a crucial turning point in the philosophy of social activism. (Conway, 1972: 171; Snay, 1977: 15) Many reformers became awakened to the problems of the working classes who were rendered unemployed. But more importantly, it demonstrated the plight of working women who were unorganized and labored long hours for low wages. Furthermore, it revealed the inadequacies of charity organizations in dealing with the negative consequences of economic depression. Hence, the settlement house movement emerged as a "spearhead for reform."

The primary purpose of the settlement house was to help the working poor. Both migrants and immigrants of the city needed help in making the transition: from rural to urban living or from a known to unknown culture. "Whatever their problems with the culture or language, clients of settlement houses were viewed as able, normal, working-class families with whom the wealthier, noble classes were joined in mutual dependence." (Axinn & Levin, 1975: 98)

In 1887, Stanton Coit and Charles Stover founded the first settlement house in New York City, the Neighborhood Guild. Perhaps the most famous settlement house was Hull House, opened by Jane Addams and Ellen Gates Starr in Chicago. The purpose of Hull House was to do something concrete to promote social justice in addition to "establishing an instrument for social, educational, humanitarian and civic reform." (Davis, 1967: 11) At the same time Addams and Starr were organizing Hull House, a group of Smith College alumnae were also organizing a settlement house. Spearheaded by Vida Scudder, the College Settlement Association was created in 1887.

While decrying the evils of industrialization, many social settlement pioneers were unsure as to how to achieve their goals. In the beginning, the settlements provided such activities as lectures and art exhibits for the working poor. However, over time it became difficult to sponsor these "reform" activities while people were unemployed or starving. Thus the settlements began to offer concrete social services similar to those of the charity organizations. Therefore, many settlements began to open day nurseries for working mothers. (Davis, 1967; Greenblatt, 1977; Woods & Kennedy, 1922)

The concept of helping "normal" families was extremely important during the Progressive era because the charity organization movement had focused on "malfunctioning" families. As one day nursery advocate noted, "I have been told by discouraged women that if they only drank and neglected their children, plenty of people would be ready to help them." (Burgess, 1892: 425) Therefore, the mothers who were provided with day nursery services did not have to suffer the humiliation of a social investigation to determine their worthiness. Instead, they were provided with a social service which allowed the mother to work. However, it is not clear that the settlement house workers sought to permanently free the mother for labor force participation. Particularly in the case of immigrant mothers, one day nursery advocate noted:

> ...Soon the immigrant family is able to adjust itself to the new surroundings and the timely assistance of the nursery has been instrumental in keeping another name from the list of applicants to the charity office. (Solomon, 1910: 465)

According to this philosophy, the working mother was acceptable as a temporary labor force participant until the family was established upon a sounder financial basis. Further, many social reformers were opposed to the unsafe, unsanitary, and exhausting forms of employment in the factories.

In addition to offering care for the children, many settlement day nurseries sponsored educational activities by incorporating the latest innovation, kindergarten. (Rosenau, 1894; Ross, 1976) Thus many children received educational stimulus beyond the physical care provided by the day nursery.

The following section more closely examines some of the goals of the day nursery as well as specific program components. Further, criticisms of the day nursery will be explored as well as the responses to the critics.

Goals of the Day Nursery, 1890 to 1918. In general, most day nurseries provided care for the typical work week, which meant staying open twelve hours per day, six days per week. Children were accepted from as young as two weeks to as old as age six. Whether sponsored by a charity organization or a settlement house, the type of child care provided embodied the virtues of cleanliness, obedience, and industriousness.[1] Not only did the day nursery advocates believe that they were preserving the family unit by preventing the institutionalization of children, but they also felt that the nursery offered superior care to that provided by the child's own mother. In fact, the day nursery was espoused as an excellent substitute for the child's mother. Indeed, the day nursery was defined as "character building" which would help break the "cycle of pauperism" of future generations. In short, not only was the day nursery a way to make poor mothers independent of charity but also it was a mechanism of "preventive philanthropy." (Dewey, 1897; Devine, 1910; Dodge, 1912; Rosenau, 1886; Rothman, 1978; Solomon, 1910)

---

[1] A typical schedule at the day nursery was as follows:

> "The mother brings her baby about seven o'clock in the morning. She enters the reception-room, not coming into the institution proper at all. A nurse, tidily dressed, with no curl papers in her hair, though it be pretty early, meets the mother, and relieves her of the child, which is taken at once to the bath-room, where its clothing is removed. It is bathed, put into the creche clothing, and taken into the play-room. So soon as a sufficient number of children arrive, a light breakfast is given them; and then they go again to the play-room, where there are toys to amuse them till the kindergarterner arrives. Kindergarten lasts till twelve, with a recess about half-past ten for a few minutes, then dinner, then the play-room again for an hour, then a nap, then more play-room, or if the weather permits, a little play in the yard...Supper is served at half-past four, and later the mother comes for the child." (Rosenau, 1894: 336)

Staff were considered important not only for the child care provided, but also for parent education. Day nursery advocates viewed the matron as someone whom the mother could trust. Thus, a mother would gradually come to share her "woes" with the matron and would receive, without offense, suggestions and advice as to good techniques of child care. (Burgess, 1892) In addition, most day nurseries established "mother's clubs." The purpose of these groups varied, but most seemed to provide tea, cookies, and lectures on child care. (Davis, 1967; Dodge, 1912; Whipple, 1929) Some groups met monthly whereas others met weekly, and generally in the evening. Where there were a large number of immigrants, a translator might be present and the range of topics was expanded to include cooking, sewing, diet, and health care.

However, organizing mother's clubs was often difficult. "This work was carried on under the most discouraging conditions, for the difficulties of giving instruction to women tired from a day's factory work, with home duties in the remaining hours, were almost insurmountable." (Whipple, 1929: 99) Yet mother's clubs were considered an important element of comprehensive care for children and families. As Whipple (1929: 99) further elaborates,

> ...Unless efforts are made to keep home conditions near the level of nursery practice and to help develop a more intelligent parenthood, most of what is accomplished in the nursery is lost. Without such a program the work does not justify the money given to support the institution.

Particularly for immigrants, the mothers' club were viewed as important tools of assimilation. As Mrs. Arthur Dodge, founder of the National Federation of Day Nurseries, stated (1912: 116):

> Most mothers too, are sensitive to the improvement in cleanliness, good habits and manners acquired by their children, and frequently a moral and social uplift is evident in a desire to live up to the higher standard in which their children are being educated.

Mrs. Dodge (1912: 115) further elaborated on the need for parent education on infant care and feeding because "such succulent dainties as bananas, ham bone, or tea, coffee, and beer in nursing bottles, have been found in chubby baby hands..." However, what these day nursery advocates failed to recognize was the newness of such items as infant formulas and appropriate baby foods. Writing about the difficulties in adjusting to a new culture, Sophonisba Breckinridge (1921) recognized the difference between lack of information and ignorance. She maintained that immigrant women had not been exposed to modern ideas about child feeding and daily bathing, which indicated a lack of information rather than ignorance.

In addition to providing parent education, many day nurseries also helped the mothers by providing employment services similar to those of the Buffalo Charity Organization Society. Given the seasonal nature and marginal jobs for low-income mothers, many women suffered from bouts of unemployment (Steinfels, 1973). By offering such employment services, the day nursery was preventing families from falling into a state of economic dependency on charity.

Criticism of Day Nurseries. Despite the pioneering efforts of settlement house workers and charity organization workers, day nurseries were established in the face of considerable antagonism. Therefore, a variety of contradictory arguments were promulgated. For example, day nurseries were charged with loosening family ties by minimizing the father's sense of responsibility for being the sole breadwinner. Another criticism was that day nurseries encouraged mothers to work and thus lessened her sense of child-rearing responsibility. (Tyson, 1938) Further, maternal employment was thought to cause infant mortality because working mothers could not nurse their children. (Beer, 1957; Greene, 1914; Tyson, 1938) A fourth criticism of the day nursery was "the actual fact of the mother's absence from home may contribute to the breaking down of normal family life." (Lundberg, 1947: 287) Children of working mothers were viewed as "underprivileged" and "handicapped" because family problems meant that a mother was forced to work. Lastly, it was charged that if mothers worked, male wages would be depressed. (Devine, 1900; Whipple) In such arguments, there was no acknowledgement of the external causation of low income or poverty, such as discrimination against imigrants and Blacks, low wages for men, irregular employment, or economic depressions.

Physicians opposed day nurseries because of the provision of infant care for children ages birth to three. Physicians felt a nursing mother should be at home with her child. (Whipple, 1929: 92-4) As one physician stated, "It takes mother-love, mother-arms, mother breast and considerable common sense to grow a human properly for the first nine months, and no institution no matter how scientific, how philanthropic, can replace these things." (Steinfels, 1973: 56) Hence like other forms of charity, the day nursery was seen as a temporary form of help which would end as soon as the mother was restored to her "proper place" in the home.

Day nurseries were further criticized when they cared for large numbers of children or when located in a tenement house. An example of one tenement house nursery was where infants and toddlers were found "crowded in unventilated family rooms, in hazardous and dirty surroundings, with exposed milk, improper food, and no place to rest but on the floor or family bed." (Whipple, 1929: 94) However, such a nursery reflected the poor housing conditions existent in low-income neighborhoods.

Criticism of the day nurseries came not only from the public but often from consumers as well. (Forest, 1927; Goldsmith, 1972) Since the day nursery was not located in low-income neighborhoods, it meant that additional time had to be allotted for travel to the nursery. This was particularly a problematic issue because public transportation was not always accessible. In addition, some parents criticized the type of care that was provided for their children. Forest (1927: 316) suggests that such criticism came from three major sources:

> ...Either the care is really poor, or the mothers are not sufficiently educated to realize what constitutes good care, or there are personal misunderstandings between the mothers and the day nursery staff. In any case, the problem is one which the institution itself must solve through improving the care given the children, or educating the community, or employing a staff better able to deal with working class mothers.

Sophonisba Breckinridge pointed to another important issue: cultural differences in child-rearing. Many immigrant groups would have preferred to use day care arrangements which reflected a respect for their own culture. One example Breckinridge (1921: 42) noted of this situation was in Chicago.

> The Ukrainians in Chicago have talked of establishing a day nursery to look after their children, but the people are poor, and it has not been possible to raise the money. In the meantime children are not sent to the day nurseries already established, but are commonly taken to neighbors, some of whom are paid for taking care of 10 or 12 children. This arrangement constitutes a violation of the city ordinance requiring day nurseries to be licensed, but is evidently a violation quite unconsciously committed by both parties to the transaction.

Hence, some of the tenement family day care homes may have reflected this preference for child care which instilled the immigrant group's cultural values.

Response to Criticisms. In response to such criticism, the goals and objectives of the day nursery became more firmly entrenched.

Responding to the charge that the day nursery was "luring" mothers away from the home, Rosenau of the Buffalo Charity Organization Society (1894: 334) proclaimed, "I do not believe that a day nursery should, under any circumstances relieve parents from their social responsibilities." Other charity organization workers continued to espouse the notion that the day nursery was a form of "self-help" for mothers who were widowed or deserted. Reform-minded advocates felt that the day nursery eased the transition of immigrants and urban migrants and prevented them from swelling the relief rolls.

As a way to further justify the existence of the day nursery, Burgess (1892: 427) recommended keeping accurate records of the achievements of the day nursery.

> If you can show a record in black and white of families that, through misfortune, needed nursery help, but with that help became self-supporting... you can convince the doubter more effectively than by pouring into his ear fifty heart-rendering stories of want and woe.

In addition, the advocates continued to emphasize the preservation of the home as a goal of the day nursery. A mother could thus keep her child at home as opposed to institutionalizing her/him in an orphanage. In addition, the special care and education which were given in the day nursery were seen as superior to the care given in the child's own home. This point was particularly emphasized in reference to immigrant families. In fact, the day nursery was seen as a tool of acculturation and assimilation for newly arrived immigrants. Lastly, the day nursery was seen as helping to prevent pauperism by influencing America's future citizens. (Dodge, 1912; Solomon, 1910)

In an effort to further guarantee the viability of day nurseries, the National Federation of Day Nurseries (NFDN) was established in 1898. (Forest, 1927: 319) The organizations' primary function was to promulgate standards for health and safety, with a secondary emphasis on education. Further, a monthly bulletin was created in order to keep staff well informed of new child care methods, such as the work of Maria Montessori. Local networks among the day nurseries were also established in cities such as New York, Boston, Cleveland, Philadelphia, and Chicago. These local organizations were particularly concerned about developing health and safety guidelines through the public health department as well as their own regulatory standards. (Greenblatt, 1977) Further, a staff-child ratio of one nurse per eight infants was recommended in response to the criticism of infant day care.

Despite efforts to ensure the viability of the day nursery, many critics felt that the day nursery symbolized the abandonment of the mother from her "proper place" in the home. According to the dominant American ideology, the mother was the protector of democratic values and educator of future citizens. Consequently, the mother's absence from the home would loosen the very foundation of American society. The following section addresses some of these issues.

The "Proper Place" of Mothers. In 1909, the first White House Conference on "The Care of Dependent Children" was convened. The first resolution of the participants was that "children of worthy parents or deserving mothers should, as a rule, be kept with their parents at home."

This conference thus focused national attention on the continued institutionalization of children of widows or deserted mothers.[1] (Doyle, 1909: 156) Hence, many conference participants recommended that such mothers be given "pensions" so that they could remain home with their children. In effect, this represented a change in ideology toward widows and deserted mothers: their "proper place" was in the home as a child rearer instead of as a worker in the labor force. As Leiby (1978: 212) states, "What was new about widow's pensions was the idea that these women were performing a service to society by raising their children and that for this service they deserved a reward. "Further, it is interesting to note that day nurseries were not a topic of discussion at this conference. Indeed, if the preservation of the home and family was a major goal, then the support of day nurseries was contrary to such an ideology.

Consequently, the first experiments in "Mothers' Pensions" were begun in Illinois and Missouri in 1911. Proponents saw four major reasons for providing such a program. First, charity organizations were not adequately handling the needs of widows and deserted mothers. For example, a 1913 study for the Massachusetts Legislature discovered that widows did not always receive immediate financial relief nor was the amount necessarily fixed or provided at regular intervals. (Lundberg, 1947: 127) Secondly, the recently legislated child labor laws reduced the potential income earned by children. Thirdly, restoring the mother to her "proper place" in the home was seen as a way to prevent the juvenile delinquency of her children. Lastly, proponents felt that the state was responsible for maintaining children in their own homes. (Bruno, 1957: 180; Lundberg, 1947: 113) As one advocate for Mothers' Pensions stated, "Motherhood has been lifted out of its long association with pauperism and the stigma of dependency has been removed from children who have lost a father's support." (Chambers, 1963: 49)

---

[1] Institutions were now abhorred not only because they were large and impersonal but also because they were seen as embodying the socialist alternative to child rearing. Such an ideology stressed that "with the coming of the socialist state, family unit, will be merged on a higher end. The wife being no longer doomed to household drudgery, will have greater blessings of economic equality. Children will be cared for by the community under healthful and uniform conditions, and we shall arrive at what has been called 'the happy time,' when the continuity of society no longer depends upon the private nursery (of the home.)" (Scanlon, 1909: 41)

However, Mothers' Pensions were a misnomer because not all low-income mothers were eligible for this program. In general, widows were perceived as worthy of such aid. However, in some states, mothers whose husbands were disabled, insane, or imprisoned were often eligible for the pensions. Further, mothers who were unskilled or semi-skilled were more likely than skilled mothers to be helped. In other words, skilled mothers were encouraged to earn a living. Lastly, women with one child were often told to work instead of being granted aid. Consequently, this program had an impact on day nursery policy in two distinct ways.

First, the women who became recipients of Mothers' Pensions were the very women day nurseries aimed to help. Hence applicants to day nurseries declined noticeably. (Forest, 1927: 313; Greenblatt, 1977: 38-9) Secondly, coupled with the continued influx of immigrants, day nurseries began to accept more children from families with two wage earners. As Mrs. Arthur Dodge, founder of the National Federation of Day Nurseries, stated:

> The basic rule of assistance for deserted women or widows obliged to work underlies all Day Nursery work, but industrial conditions have changed to such an extent that exceptions must be made and there are now more cases where father and mother are working. The low prices paid for unskilled labor, the scarcity of work for men in some communities where women find no difficulty in obtaining employment, illness or partial physical disability of husbands, are all factors in determining cases... (Dodge, 1912: 115)

Consequently, many eligible mothers chose to utilize the new pension system rather than working and using day nurseries. In this way, such mothers were conforming to the dominant American ideology which dictated that a woman's proper place was in the home. Further, with the rise of Mothers' Pensions, day nurseries were perceived as disdainful and stigmatized as a less desirable form of help. (Greenblatt, 1977; Tyson, 1938)

However, such stigmatization did not deter the development of the day nursery as a charitable institution. Indeed, such criticism provided another reason to advocate for the professionalization of day nursery services. The following section more closely examines the growing professionalization of social work and its impact on the day nursery.

Professionalization of Social Work. One of the first hints of professionalism stemmed from the redefinition of the "paid agent" in the charity organization society. Prior to 1900, the paid agent was the tool of the friendly visitor who handled the paperwork and administrative details of the charity organization society, such as the registration of clients. The success of the paid agent was measured in her ability to stimulate interested volunteers to become friendly visitors. But after 1900, the paid agent considered herself a "creative practitioner" rather than a servant to volunteers. Her expertise in investigation and administration neutralized the superior social status of the volunteers. Therefore, the value of voluntary service was questioned in a period of functional specialization and presumptions of expertise. (Lubove, 1965)

Hence, a new concept in charity work evolved: neither "alms" nor a "friend," but a professional service would be offered. As Warner *et al*. states (1930: 25-6)

> Professionalism meant skilled service in place of or in addition to good intentions and sympathy; making knowledge and skill available to persons who wish to use them rather than setting out to reform people regardless of their wishes in the matter; sporting interest in a difficult task rather than smug satisfaction of "doing good"; and expectation of reasonable compensation rather than a spirit of self-sacrifice.

The major dilemma was to define the various functions social workers could perform in the context of existing institutions. Consequently, both paid charity workers as well as settlement house workers sought to justify their activities.

By the end of the Progressive Era, reformers had achieved social progress especially in the areas of slum housing, unsanitary food practices, and child labor reform. However, many settlement house workers had given up some of their grander aspirations and were content to have smaller roles in social change. (O'Neill, 1969) Further, many investigations of industrial or urban conditions had been incorporated into governmental forms of regulation.

The social reform movement also influenced the charity organization workers. The external or environmental causation of poverty had emerged to supercede the previous notion of individual causation. Consequently, charity workers could no longer justify intervention into the lives of the poor based on moral reform or spiritual uplift. The new rationale for working with the poor was that the charity worker had "professional expertise" to offer. However, the charity worker was still concerned with human behavior and saw the social environment as explaining both limitations and potentialities of individuals. Treatment would necessarily involve helping the individual to adjust to the environment rather than changing the environment to improve the quality of life. (Chambers, 1963; Lubove, 1965)

During the early twentieth century, social welfare practice was moving from "cause" to "function" in an effort to define professional skills unique to social work. In the process of defining the profession, an inductive method was utilized by early practitioners. In other words, social workers sought to define their skills by obtaining employment in various institutions, such as hospitals, schools, and juvenile courts. The unique skill social workers had to offer was the ability to mediate between the individual in the institution and her/his social environment. Whereas the effectiveness of these institutions had been limited by the failure to consider the social context of the individual, the gap would now be bridged. Consequently, the profession came to be defined as the sum total of the duties and functions performed by the social workers in affiliation with various institutions. (Lubove, 1965) Indeed, it will be argued that day nurseries were just another example of social workers affiliating themselves with an institution in an effort to define their unique professional skills.

In the quest to define their unique contributions as a profession, social workers were offered a major challenge by Abraham Flexner at the 1915 National Conference of Charities and Corrections. Delivering a speech entitled "Is Social Work a Profession?" Flexner proposed six criteria for guidelines: (1) a profession had intellectual operations with large individual responsibility for decision-making, (2) possessed raw material derived from science and learning, (3) utilized the raw material for practical and definite ends, (4) developed techniques which were educationally communicable, (5) tended to move toward self-organization, and (6) stressed interest in altruistic goals over pecuniary ends. (Flexner, 1961: 303) However, Flexner did not consider social work to be a profession for two major reasons. The "intellectual operations" of the social worker incorporated "fine powers of analysis and discrimination, breadth and flexibility of sympathy, sound judgment, skill in utilizing whatever resources are available, (and) facility in devising new combinations." (Flexner, 1961: 303) However, such activities suggested that the social worker was a "mediator" between the individual and the charity organization. Social work thus "appears not so much a definite field as an aspect of many fields." (Flexner, 1961: 304) Hence the goal of social work was to improve the quality of life for individuals which suggested a multifaceted purpose rather than a singular aim. Secondly, the "raw materials" for social work practice were not unique, but instead relied upon existing knowledge from economics, ethics, religion, and medicine. For these reasons, Flexner concluded that social work was not a profession but at least had a "professional spirit."

In response to such criticism, Lubove (1965: 106-7) suggested that Flexner failed to realize that "opening the lines of communication between individuals, classes and institutions and community resource mobilization could be defended as legitimate 'professional' responsibilities." Even social workers were not content to have this as the unique contribution of their profession. In any event, Flexner's critique sent huge reverberations throughout the social work community.

What marked the turning point in the quest for professional status was Mary Richmond's Social Diagnosis which was published in 1917. (Chambers, 1963; Leiby, 1978) A leader in the charity organization movement, Richmond stressed that a social worker's unique "intellectual operation" was to "treat" the individual based upon the expert collection and interpretation of social evidence. Thus, a "social diagnosis" was:

> the attempt to make as exact a definition as possible of the situation and personality of a human being in some social need - of his situation and personality, that is, in relation to the other human beings upon whom he in any way depends or who depend upon him, and in relation to the social institutions of the community. (Richmond, 1917: 357)

Hence, social workers began to feel that they had at least the beginnings of a scientific knowledge base as well as a specialized skill. (Warner et al., 1930) In a later treatise, What is Social Casework? (1922), Richmond further elaborated on the role of casework, or the social diagnosis process, in social work. Casework was a process which helped the individual adjust to social demands while concurrently helping to change her/his surrounding environment. Further, casework emphasized "client participation" which eliminated the patronizing overtones from the past activities of friendly visitors. In short, Richmond viewed individuals in their social context and allowed them to maintain some semblance of human dignity. Thus Richmond sought to explain the unity of social work despite its practice in a variety of institutional settings. The following chapter will more clearly demonstrate precisely how social workers functioned in relation to the day nursery.

CHAPTER 2

The Professionalization of the Day Nursery, 1919 to 1930

The major challenge to the social work profession in the 1920's was whether to continue along the path of "psycho-social casework" as espoused by Mary Richmond or to embrace" psycho-therapeutic" techniques as advocated by Virginia Robinson. (Chambers, 1963; Warner et al., 1930) Psychotherapeutic casework redefined the process whereby problems were identified and solved. Instead of emphasizing the environmental influences on social problems, Robinson (1930) advocated that the most important aspect of an individual's "reality" was internal. Hence, social workers should abandon "social diagnosis" in favor of emphasizing the client's own interpretation of her/his internal experiences. Further, the benefits of psychotherapeutic casework could be extended to all classes of people, not just the poor. In essence, psychotherapeutic casework would make the social worker more proficient in diagnosis and thus help to establish casework as a form of therapy.

Reflecting the changing trends in social work ideology, day nursery advocates presented their ideas at both the National Conference on Social Work and the White House Conference on Children. The first two sections of this chapter analyze the discussions at these conferences.

The third section addresses the incorporation of preschool education into the day nursery as a way to ensure its future and further professionalize the services. The fourth section evaluates the factors associated with the increase in number of day nurseries by 1930, the professionalization of staff, and the evolution of other forms of early childhood intervention: nursery schools, relief nursery schools, and play schools. These early childhood programs were important to the delivery of day care services in that they provided sources of contrast in service delivery and created social class distinctions among the various programs.

Social Work Influence on Day Nurseries, 1919-1930. Grace Caldwell, of the New England Center of Day Nurseries, clearly demonstrated the influence of social workers on day nursery functioning. Expressions such as "problem families," "correct social diagnosis," "maladjustment," and "temporary expedient" dominated her speech at the 1919 National Conference on Social Work. It should be noted that during the 1920's the "below normal home" was defined by many different criteria. If the father was disabled, ill, unemployed, insane, imprisoned, or gave no economic support to the family, then the family was "below normal." If the mother was unmarried, ill, deserted, separated, or divorced, then the child came from a "broken home." Lastly, if the family was in debt, they were also "abnormal." (Whipple, 1929: 94)

In any event, Caldwell's discussion began with a delineation of three critical variables which influenced the functioning of day nurseries. (Caldwell, 1919: 42) The first issue was the type of families that used day nurseries:

> The nursery deals with a family problem. That we spend the greater part of our funds for the care of the children does not alter the fact that the reason we do so is because of some maladjustment in the families of which they are members, and it is to get at the cause of this maladjustment and to build up normal family conditions that our nursery care works towards. (Caldwell, 1919: 42)

The second factor was that the staff of the day nursery could mediate between the child and her/his social environment.

> If we see our job in the large, our objective will be to get Johnny back into the normal home as soon as constructive work will allow...If the problem is simple, it is sometimes possible for the nursery to do this work alone, but more often it must be done with good team work with other social agencies working towards the same ends. (Caldwell, 1919: 42)

Lastly, there were economic dangers of "an extension of our work in the form of industrial nurseries or (in) localities where large foreign groups and low wages for men exist, together... such nurseries are a menace to the establishment of good social conditions." (Caldwell, 1919: 42) Hence there was an interest in helping working mothers, but only on a temporary basis until they could return to their "proper place" in the home.

Such an attitude toward day nurseries represented a slight change from the original philosophy of the late nineteenth century. Whereas day nurseries were originally viewed as providing "self-help" to the "worthy" mother or as helping the family with two wage earners, day nurseries were now viewed as a social welfare agency aimed at helping the "pathologically" poor family. Instead of the Progressive view of the external causations of poverty (such as industrialization, immigration, and urbanization), Caldwell's speech implies that there was an individual or internal causation of poverty. Thirdly, rather than having families request the services of a day nursery, selective standards of admission would be used to determine which "problem families" needed the services. Lastly, day nurseries were not to be located in neighborhoods characterized by poverty or low wages. In other words, precisely where such services were most needed. Thus, tenement day nurseries and similar forms of convenient day care should not be opened or it would lead to the sanctioning of mothers' employment, thereby depressing male wages.

Therefore, the solution to these issues was a "social diagnosis" to determine which families should receive the services. This entailed assessing:

> ...Whether the situation is acute or chronic. Then whether the family is already known to other relief agencies, using a confidential exchange if there is one in the community...I can imagine you thinking, as I know you must, that the family may starve or go to pieces while this program is being carried out. It can be done in 24 to 36 hours if you have someone trained to do such work. (Caldwell, 1919: 43)

Naturally, a trained social worker was perfect as a social investigator. A social worker was:

> ...Trained in the principles of good relief work. Trained in the underlying causes of social maladjustment; (trained) to select the point most necessary in a thorough understanding of the situation, with the knowledge of the resources of her district at her fingers' ends, with the faculty of giving and getting co-operation. (Caldwell, 1919: 43)

Caldwell (1919) also emphasized the importance of casework beyond determining admissions to the day nursery. While using the day nursery, each family should be reviewed at regular intervals to determine if "conditions have changed and if the nursery is meeting the difficulty." (Caldwell, 1919: 44) Further, once the family no longer used the day nursery, they were still visited by a caseworker to ensure "proper adjustment" or to determine if other social services were necessary. Clearly, Caldwell was emphasizing the importance of such activities as a way to expand the skills of the social worker. In fact, Caldwell (1919: 45) states quite openly, "We ask from other agencies a recognition of the part we may rightly play in such efforts toward community welfare."

Another critical aspect of the initial "social diagnosis" was the discouragement of maternal employment. In assessing whether a family truly needed the day nursery, the social worker might recommend that a mother remain at home with her children. This issue was also discussed at the 1919 National Conference on Social Work by Caroline Hedger, a physician. Hedger's (1919: 45) recommendation was that the social worker should examine the family budget and recommend adjustments "so that they may get the best out of the limited family income." Such a recommendation was based on the assumption that the mother was working for "pin money" rather than out of economic necessity. Hedger also reiterated the view that mothers belong at home with their infants under nine months old:

> ...We shall never have the right to interupt breast-feeding. It is a tool which we cannot supply in this matter of building the bodies of children. (Hedger, 1919: 46)

Following both these presentations at the National Conference on Social Work, Helen Tyson stated that some social workers begrudge day nurseries because they "so often offer the easiest but worst way out for the woman" because they "allow a situation to remain latent until the opportunity to do constructive work for the mother is lost." (Caldwell, 1919: 50) In other words, a "maladjustment" in the family, such as divorce or low male wages, caused the mother to enter the labor force. By that time, casework intervention to prevent maternal employment or to achieve resolution of the "problem" might be too late.

A similar commentary on the attitudes of social workers towards the day nurseries was expressed by Frances Colbourne (1920: 129) in a popular social welfare journal of the early twentieth century, The Survey:

> For many years the day nursery has been looked upon with decided disfavor by the trained social worker, who saw in it a relic of the old, non-constructive charity involving no attempt at cooperation with other welfare agencies and with no further thought in view than the kindly, but too often ignorant, feeding and sheltering of a given number of children for a given number of hours.

Hence, if a day nursery staff did not have the attributes of professionalism, social workers viewed their services as "kindly but ignorant." With the increased professionalization of social work, there was greater emphasis on the necessity of casework in the day nursery and investigation into the causes of maternal employment. At least earlier advocates acknowledged the necessity of maternal employment (under certain circumstances) as well as the importance of day nurseries as a viable alternative to orphanages. No longer an agency of self-help for "worthy" families, the day nursery became a child welfare agency for children from "below normal homes."[1]

Colbourne (1925) continued to advocate for the inclusion of casework services in the day nursery. Yet many day nurseries did not have a social worker on their staff during the 1920's as indicated by the studies in Pennsylvania and New York City. (See Appendix A for a discussion of these studies.) However, those day nurseries which did have casework staff could provide:

---

[1] Commenting on these issues at the 1921 National Conference on Social Work, Mabel Gillam of the Chicago Day Nursery Association stated:

> Free from disease is about all that can be said for the children presented for day-nursery care. Of course, they are not in good condition. They suffered with the rest of the family in the crises that drove the mother to work. (Gillam, 1921: 110)

Gillam further describes the "average" child at the day nursery:

> The average child presented at the day nursery is a nervous, high-strung youngster who does not know how to eat, sleep, or play properly. He is usually a coffee-drinker and has few if any correct habits. How could he have? The mother, even if she knew the principles of child-rearing (and usually she does not) has been far too busy trying to meet her economic problems to do the right thing for the children. (Gillam, 1921: 110)

Hence children in the day nurseries needed a great deal of attention in order to help them achieve "normality."

1. Health supervision of all family members;
2. Correction of bad housing and sanitation;
3. Child care instruction for the mother;
4. Cooperation with other social service agencies;
5. Supervision of school work of school-aged children;
6. Attention to other family problems.

(Colbourne, 1925: 442)

In addition, Colbourne recommended that caseworkers become aware of the standards of "quality" day care so as not to utilize inadequate facilities. The perpetuation of low quality or "unprofessional" day nurseries was unacceptable to Colbourne. Further, the day nursery was abused when "...the family welfare society...uses the day nursery as a dumping ground, until it is ready to make a more constructive plan for the family concerned..." (Colbourne, 1925: 443) Colbourne clearly saw the day nursery as an important multipurpose social work agency with its own goals and objectives.

Thus rather than ignoring or deprecating the existence of the day nurseries, social workers in the 1920's used them as one other institutional setting in which to define their own philosophy, goals, and objectives. However, by viewing families who used such services as "maladjusted" or "abnormal" the stigma attached to day nurseries was only increased. Clearly, social workers had transformed the day nursery by using the new "scientific techniques" of social casework.

Changing Goals and Philosophy for Day Care, 1919 to 1930. The 1919 decentennial White House Conference was convened by the Children's Bureau and focused on "standards for child welfare." A physician from New York City, Dr. Josephine Baker, presented a paper which marked the first time national attention was focused on day nurseries as a child welfare issue. Baker recommended uniform regulations with a special emphasis on health care.

> ...Very few of our states or cities have established any standards at all and the day nursery, in a number of instances, has come to be looked upon as a commercial proposition, maintained for gain, and sometimes to the actual detriment of the children who are cared for. (Baker, 1919: 220)

Hence, regulations were necessary to sanction the operation of day nurseries as a social service and to prevent the growth of inadequate facilities.

In addition to providing custodial care, the objectives of the day nursery were to offer "mental and social training" for two- to six-year-olds as well as health care and the correction of any "existing physical defects." Baker elaborately delineated the type of health check-ups necessary to prevent the spread of contagious diseases which was an important concern in an era of undeveloped vaccines and unsophisticated health care. Baker further recommended that day nurseries be located in community health centers or social settlements.

> As parents have become accustomed to these neighborhood houses, they are particularly desirable for these purposes, giving the mothers a sense of security when leaving their babies or very young children. (Baker, 1919: 221)

However, what is more interesting about Baker's presentation is the discussion that followed. Ms. Myrna Brocket, of the Hull House day nursery, stated "the objective of the day nursery effort is fundamentally to raise the standard of home and family life." She also recommended that education be an integral part of the day nursery. For this purpose, kindergarten teachers should be hired and student teachers should be trained in the day nursery. In fact, Brocket recommended that various professionals be a part of the staff: a nurse, household economist, and a trained social worker who could "bring about effective cooperation between nursery and home life." Such staff were important because "there has been a proneness to isolation and too great a reliance upon sentiment for guidance in methods." (Baker, 1919: 227)

Following a completely different theme, Mrs. Eleanor Barton, of the Women's Cooperative Guild in England, stated that day nurseries were a part of "the great industrial problem." She opposed the expansion of such services if it allowed mothers to enter industry "for someone else to make a profit out of them." (Baker, 1919: 227) In short, Barton was concerned about exploitation of female labor. She further maintained "that it is not the socialists who are going to break up the homes, but it is industry which is going to break up the homes." (Baker, 1919: 233) However, it should be noted that Barton supported women entering the labor force if they were in one of the "professions." Such women would have "free time" each day, a luxury working-class mothers lacked. By implication, mothers employed in a professional job would be in a better financial position to hire household help as well as a "nanny." Thus Barton advocated for "mothers' allowances" so that working-class women would not have to enter industry.

Agreeing with Mrs. Barton, a member of the California Board of Charities recommended that "every worker for children ought to join the fight for a living wage for men, and to see that women do not go into industry." (Baker, 1919: 231) Further, some of the family service agencies in California did not support day nurseries because it was thought that exposure to germs of other children would cause an increase in infant mortality. Hence, rigorous health care standards were crucial for the day nursery.

In response to such criticism, Mr. Mulon of France's War Department, maintained that government allowances to mothers instead of day nurseries would be inadequate. "Well, the day nursery may cost a great deal, but the money would be only enough to keep her from starvation." (Baker, 1919: 229) In France, industrial day nurseries were provided as an alternative to boarding homes for young children, which had high rates of infant mortality. Acknowledging that mothers were ultimately better off remaining at home, Mr. Mulon was a day nursery advocate "only for the mother that cannot stay at home" because she needs to work for survival. (Baker, 1919: 230)

Clearly, the early dialogues of regulations and standards would often lead into discussions of the necessity of day nurseries, the "proper place" of mothers in society, the role of social workers, and fear of contagious diseases as well as infant mortality. Thus by 1923, only six states provided day nursery guidelines and two cities had local ordinances. (Colbourne, 1924: 395) As Tyson (1938: 15) suggested, "part of the neglect of the problem has been due perhaps to the widespread disparagement of the day nursery as an institution of child care." Despite the controversy surrounding day nurseries, by 1929 the National Federation of Day Nurseries developed comprehensive standards. Their recommendations covered "housing; sanitation; fire protection; medical and health supervision; admission requirements in relation to age, physical condition and parental status; family investigation; parental education; educational program; and personnel as related to the size and ages of the groups under care." (Bogue and Moran, 1929, 118)

Education in the Day Nursery. Early childhood educators began to emphasize that the only way the day nursery could become a permanent institution was to stress education over philanthropy. (Forest, 1927: 321) As one popular theorist of the time, Arnold Gesell, stated in his book, The Preschool Child:

> The day nursery as an economic necessity is still on the defensive and should be kept there. It cannot be fully justified on purely economic grounds, if there is any social device which will enable the mother to preserve her natural relations to her young children. Wherever day nurseries are maintained the rights of the family should be safeguarded by insisting on rigorous examination of each case before admission. (Gesell, 1923: 55)

Hence, the new "social device" was either the nursery school or the "progressive" day nursery, which had a strong educational component. In short, Gesell viewed maternal employment and the day nursery as a "last resort."

Accepting children as young as twelve months old, the nursery school sought to supplement the family influence on the child. As stated by one of the early nursery school advocates, Margaret McMillan (1919: 22), young children

> ...Need that very important kind of early education called Nurture. Can this be given, and given entirely, by, let us say, the average mother? The well-to-do mother never attempts to do it alone. She engages a nurse, perhaps also a governess, perhaps a school-room maid; a great many engage a cook, also a housemaid.

With the curtailment of immigration in the 1920's, governesses and nursemaids were rare and expensive. Hence nursery schools became extremely popular for the middle class. Not only did mothers feel that the nursery school would benefit their child(ren) but it also gave them some free time of their own. (Beer, 1957: 38)

Hence, many day nurseries began to offer a nursery school component because it provided a curriculum for infants and toddlers whereas kindergarten instruction began at age four or five. Furthermore, the nursery school had broader educational goals than kindergartens. The child's intellectual, social, emotional, and physical development was emphasized. In fact, many kindergartens were adding a nursery school component to their programs. (Meek, 1929) Some of the nursery schools employed social workers for home visiting, but this was primarily for immigrant families. (Greenblatt, 1977: 54; Whipple, 1929)

What is critical to note is the number of hours the nursery schools were open each day. While some were open only three hours per day, others were open as long as twelve hours. (Forest, 1927: 337; Meek, 1929: 291-2) Therefore, what may have evolved is a class distinction in clientele of day nurseries and nursery schools. It is entirely possible that middle-class working mothers sent their children to nursery schools whereas poor women had to use day nurseries. And while day nurseries maintained their social service orientation, nursery schools stressed educational goals.

Therefore, teachers sought jobs in nursery schools before they went to the day nursery. The day nursery was unappealing because it meant full-time employment and minimal educational activities. However, if preschool teachers were unable to find employment, they went to the day nursery as a last resort. Despite their lack of appeal, most day nurseries employed nursery school teachers by 1929. (Greenblatt, 1977)

Initially, the nursery school teachers caused friction with the leisure-class volunteers in the day nursery. Volunteers worked intermittently and viewed their involvement as a "glamorous adventure." (Beer, 1938: 115) Furthermore, the nursery school instructors were interested in educating the children as well as training student teachers. (Bogue and Moran, 1929: 119)

By the end of the decade, "progressive" day nurseries included strong educational components. (Forest, 1927; Greenblatt, 1977) However scant evidence is available as to how many day nurseries became "progressive." Greenblatt (1977) maintains that only a few underwent such a change.

In any event, three aspects of the nursery school movement were critical for day nurseries. The first aspect was that nursery schools provided middle-class mothers with an acceptable arrangement of full-time care and education of their young children. Consequently, day nurseries became even more stigmatized and lower-class oriented. Secondly, nursery school teachers replaced many of the untrained volunteers in the day nursery and thus represented another step toward staff professionalization. Thirdly, the incorporation of preschool education was deemed critical for the survival of the day nursery because many individuals could not accept the existence of an institution whose primary purpose was to allow mothers to work.

Growth of Day Nurseries by 1930. Writing in the first edition of the social work yearbook, Bogue and Moran (1929: 119) stated that day nurseries had become a more acceptable adjunct to family service agencies. An increasing number of caseworkers were employed in the day nursery and studies continued to be conducted to determine adequacy of services. Directors of day nurseries were continually sought who had training in one or more of the following fields: social casework, teaching, public health, mental hygiene, recreation, or home economics.

About 50 percent of all day nurseries had philanthropic auspices in 1930. Slightly more than five percent were publicly sponsored, and a few had university affiliations. The remaining 42 percent were proprietary in sponsorship. (Greenblatt, 1977: 48) In short, the nationwide increase in day nurseries from 1923 to 1929 was approximately 15 percent, or from 613 centers to 700 centers.

Middle-class women did express an interest in day nurseries during the 1920's. However, they probably utilized the proprietary centers or the latest pre-school innovation, nursery schools. However, according to Greenblatt (1977: 50) no empirical data exist on the income levels of children in proprietary day nurseries.

The 1930 White House Conference on Children was important for day care policy because the first national survey of early childhood care and intervention was conducted. The data collected represented the development of services from 1920 to 1930. Of the estimated 700 day nurseries in existence by 1930, 511 provided data for the survey. (Anderson, 1931b) The purposes of most day nurseries remained essentially unaltered: 91.6 percent provided services to children of working mothers. However, other purposes for service delivery were also indicated: 44.7 percent of the day nurseries emphasized activities to enhance the physical growth of children and 29.5 percent emphasized the provision of education.

However, day nurseries were not the only institutions providing care for children of working mothers. A new institution was created by combining the day nursery and the nursery school: the "relief nursery school." By 1930, there were approximately 60 relief nursery schools in existence. Anderson (1931b: 45) discovered that 75 percent of these schools existed to provide education to three- and four-year-olds. However, roughly 52 percent also claimed that their services were created to enable mothers to work. The main differences between the day nursery and the relief nursery school were the emphasis placed on education, group size, and the average age of children in attendence.

The day nursery had a group size of 58 children whereas the relief nursery school had 31 children. The age range of children in the day nursery was from birth to eight, the average age being 5.1 years old. The children attending the relief nursery schools were between ages one and six, the mean age being 3.9 years. When compared to the regular nursery school, the relief nursery school differed in the length of day as well as group size. The typical nursery school was only open a half-day and educated an average of 19 children per school.

Financial auspices differed for the three institutions. Nearly 50 percent of the financial support of day nurseries came primarily from philanthropic organizations and approximately 40 percent of funds came from private individuals. The remainder of day nurseries were funded through school boards or other miscellaneous organizations. (Greenblatt, 1977) However, a minimal tuition was charged for all families using the day nursery. Financial support of relief nursery schools was similar to that of day nurseries. Only regular nursery schools were primarily self-supporting through tuition charges.

The professional staff and their educational qualifications varied greatly among these three institutions. The nursery schools had a 1:9 teacher-child ratio and 71 percent of the teachers were college trained. The relief nursery schools had a 1:13 staff-child ratio and 45.6 percent of the staff had some form of teacher training. The day nurseries had the highest staff-child ratio: 1:24.4 and only 13 percent of the teachers had attended college. However, about 25 percent of the staff did have some special training beyond high school. (Anderson, 1931b: 27, 84)

It is not clear why the day nursery attracted less qualified personnel. The number of hours worked per week was 30.4, which was similar to the work week in a nursery school. Only the administrator of the day nursery put in long hours, ranging anywhere from 51 to 57 hours per week. One can only speculate that since the day nursery was less educational in orientation, as well as stigmatized as a charity service, that qualified personnel sought the day nursery as the last resort of employment. However, Anderson (1931a: 162-3) noted that many day nurseries began to alter their programs:

> Apparently, a number of day nurseries, becoming aware of the possibilities of an educational program, are modifying their own activities in the direction of the nursery school program. They are reducing the load on the staff, providing more equipment, and attempting to develop an educational policy.

However, evolving an educational orientation meant an increase in the salaries paid if qualified personnel were desired. Low teacher salaries may be the other reason why day nurseries were a less desirable form of employment.

One other form of early childhood intervention is worth mentioning: the play schools. Play schools were developed through parental initiative. The activities were similar to those in the nursery school and lasted only a few hours per day. Frequently, professional assistance was sought from educators on college faculty, but play schools were largely parent-operated cooperatives. Further, play schools were essentially a middle-class venture created to supplement family influence. However, Anderson (1936: 266-7) reported that only 1.3 percent of children in the national 1930 survey attended such schools.

In sum, by the 1930's there were several new forms of early childhood education and intervention: the nursery school, relief nursery schools, and play schools as well as the day nursery. However, because of the development of the more educationally-oriented nursery schools, day nurseries became increasingly stigmatized as charity for the less fortunate.

CHAPTER 3

Day Care During the Depression Years, 1931 to 1940

Following the stock market crash of 1929, the United States economy was dramatically altered. One of the severest consequences was the rate of unemployment, which went as high as 25 percent in 1933. However, because of the widespread unemployment, many individuals once again acknowledged the external causation of poverty similar to the ideology espoused during the Progressive Era. Consequently, many mothers were forced to seek employment because it was necessary for survival. (Bogue & Moran, 1933; Lockwood, 1937; Pyke, 1936) However, working mothers were still viewed as "deviant" according to the dominant American ideology. In fact, working mothers were thought to take away the jobs from male breadwinners during the Depression years. (Chafe, 1972) However, this was rarely the case because (1) most jobs continued to remain sex-role stereotyped so that women and men did not compete for the same jobs, and (2) the majority of women did not have the college education to acquire jobs as lawyers, physicians, or in other "white collar" professions.

The Depression ushered in a new era of government intervention into the economy, especially in the areas of social welfare as well as employment. As a result of this national crisis, the federal government provided funds for the first time to develop day care centers. However, rather than providing a community service to help all working mothers, the purpose of federal funds for day care was to provide jobs for unemployed teachers, nurses, nutritionists, and janitors. Approximately 3,000 day nurseries were built to care for 65,000 young children. (See Appendix B for full explanation.)

Another important program during the New Deal era was the development of "Aid to Dependent Children," which represented an expansion of Mothers' Pension Program sponsored by most states. This program was created for two reasons. First of all, it was recognized that the existing program was ineffective and underfunded. Supporters of A.D.C. thus sought to ensure that more children would benefit from the program and that uniform regulations would exist in every state. Secondly, a special program was needed for fatherless families who would not benefit from government-sponsored work programs or job-related social insurance programs. Hence, A.D.C. was created to help female-headed households.[1] Once again, eligibility was defined by the death, desertion, or incapacity (physical or mental) of the male breadwinner. However states were allowed to define their own eligibility criteria as long as it did not violate federal standards. (Bell, 1965) Thus, as Tyson (1935: 108) pointed out, "until the public program (A.D.C.) is more adequately and comprehensively developed, day nurseries will unquestionably have a place in the social work of their communities."

---

[1] The program was also renamed in an effort to clarify the intended beneficiaries of the program. As stated in the 1935 Report to the President by the U.S. Committee on Economic Security, A.D.C. was "designed to release from the wage earning role the person whose natural function is to give her children the physical and affectionate guardianship necessary not alone to keep them from falling into social misfortune, but more affirmatively to rear them into citizens capable of contributing to society." (Bremner, 1974: 528)

The purpose of this chapter is to examine some of the unexplored aspects of day care delivery during the 1930's. The first aspect is the development of "foster family day care homes." Such services marked one of the earliest attempts to respond to parental preferences for day care. The second section focuses on the concern for the "mental hygiene" of children in the day nursery. This concern reflected the attitude that children of working mothers came from "maladjusted families." But before embarking upon a discussion of these two new aspects of day care, the following section explores some persistent themes in regard to social work.

Social Work and the Day Nursery. Not even the impact of the Depression would decrease the importance of casework in the day nursery. As one social worker stated at the 1935 conference of the National Federation of Day Nurseries, casework

> ...Involves a human, sympathetic skillful consideration of families, family by family, individual by individual, and of the ways of making it possible...for each family and each person in this family to develop in his own way and to reach what might be called his own "high water mark." (Child Welfare League of America, 1935: 1)

Clearly, casework services were espoused as an important element of day nursery delivery.

In addition to advocating casework services, many themes continued to persist in day care policy. (Bogue, 1931; Bogue and Moran, 1933; Tyson, 1935; Williamson, 1931) For example, the care of infants was still discouraged. In fact, those day nurseries which accepted children under nine months of age were not considered to be "good" programs. Further, the day nursery was still seen as a "paragon of child care" worth emulating in the home. And educational activities continued to gain ascendancy in many day nurseries. Field trips to the museum or symphony were among the more innovative activities in the early 1930's.

Another persistent theme existing during the 1930's was the value of day care services for low-income children. A well-respected day nursery advocate, Ethel Beer, wrote one of the first books on day nurseries in 1938. In describing the children who attend the day nursery, Beer (1938: 9) states that they were "infants born into the forbidding environment of our slums, with their appalling poverty, dirt, darkness, disease, and crime." Thus, the day nursery represents a good place for these children: "After their tempestuous homes, it is a haven of peace for them." (Beer, 1938: 20) Beer (1938: 54) also manages to stereotype the family of the day nursery child as well: "In many poor families they scarcely ever have a sit-down meal. Very often the children do not eat in their own home but on the street where they are playing." In short, the day nursery child comes from a deprived environment which produces maladaptive behavior: temper tantrums, short attention spans, and a fear of adults because the children were physically beaten. However, Beer (1938: 184) claimed that the day nursery could "compensate" for the child's deprivation and help ner/him to develop into a "normal" human being.

In fact, Beer was so enthusiastic about the value of the day nursery that she claimed that it could even benefit middle class children whose mothers work. (Beer, 1938: 211) "There is no reason why the day nursery in itself should be an abnormal environment for the normal child. More and more pre-school children of every class are attending nursery schools because their parents realize that even the toddler needs the companionship of its contemporaries." (Beer, 1936: 42) Beer also reiterated a suggestion made by Rademacher (1937) that the day nursery could supervise the child from every aspect, including educational, social, hygenic, and mental health. Beer (1936: 46) even suggested the possibility of longitudinal research: by "starting with them as babies and following them in their careers through grammar, high school and up to adulthood, the day nursery could perform a service of inestimable value as a studio of human behavior."

In essence, Beer was suggesting that the day nursery could "break the cycle of poverty," which is a continuous theme in the history of day care policy. Further, the day nursery could benefit the "normal" child from the middle-class home as well as serve as a laboratory for child growth and development. Yet Beer viewed the day nursery as a social service strategy, rather than as a community service. "Because the day nursery deals only with the impoverished child it is a social agency. That is, it constitutes one of the numerous developments vaguely covered by the term social service. Its role is one which definitely catalogues it as a relief measure." (Beer, 1938: 24) Yet because "custodial" day nurseries still existed, "social service hesitates to claim this institution as a whole. This is comprehensible in view of the meaning conveyed by social service." (Beer, 1938: 182) Hence, the message was clear: day nurseries should strive toward increased professionalization in order to be fully embraced by the social service profession. However, what is interesting to note is that Beer (1938: 206-7) opposed the establishment of a day nursery in a settlement house because

> It is only one of the departments and has no definite correlation to the rest of the work ...This does not give it any chance to develop along its own lines but only as a branch of the larger enterprise. Thus it is so swamped by the entire movement that it cannot prove its worth.

Instead, Beer recommended that the day nursery comprise its own institution with its own casework staff.

However, Keiser (1939: 317) notes that some day nurseries were reluctant to employ caseworkers:

> In the beginning, there was a fear that we might try to "take over" the nursery or recommend that it be closed, that we might be rigid in decisions as to admissions and fees ...The day nursery Board is proud that we recommend relief instead of work for mothers and permit them to stay at home with their children... and that they are really a part of the wider community planning picture instead of a rather segregated institution.

Thus, by the close of the 1930 decade, casework strategies were viewed with less hostility by the non-social work staff and day nursery advocates. Further, admission practices to day nurseries in some cities was becoming more sophisticated: there was a central intake agency which screened all applicants and provided any necessary casework services.

In addition to casework services, child development activities were seen as a critical component of the "good" day nursery. In fact, some colleges and universities began to offer courses on day nurseries. For example, Teachers' College of Columbia University offered college credit courses on the child guidance and social welfare aspects of day nursery work. (Bogue and Moran, 1933: 118) Many professionals also stressed the educational component of day nurseries by suggesting its similarity, rather than difference, to the nursery school. The primary difference between the two programs "lie in the basis of admission rather than in the children received or the ways of meeting their needs." (Tyson, 1935: 118) However, many nursery schools still continued to operate for a full day by 1933. Some were even open 24 hours per day, but the median was six to eight hours daily. (Meek, 1933: 321) Hence, one can assume the continuance of a class distinction in clientele of the day nursery and nursery school. However, Bogue (1931) claimed that many business and professional women began to use the day nurseries in the 1930's. This may be due, in part, to the impact of the Depression and the need to have less expensive child care than the nursery school.

Despite the economic consequences of the Depression, which thrust many mothers into the labor market, several social workers reiterated the negative consequences for the children. (Bogue, 1931; Keiser, 1936)

LaGrange (February, 1930: 3) clearly stated that the home and family life were to be preserved if children were to grow up to be normal, healthy human beings. If a mother worked, this contributed to abnormal family life which in turn caused:

> 1. No early training to face life.
> 2. No feeling of belonging or of family solidarity during dependent years.
> 3. No feeling of family responsibility.
> 4. Unstable emotional attitudes or abnormal attachments.
> 5. No early vision of family contentment.
> 6. No training in co-operative effort or of family responsibility.
>
> (LaGrange, February, 1930: 3)

LaGrange concludes her article by implying that mothers should not work. Instead, efforts should be directed toward evolving a national policy which allowed low-income mothers to remain at home.

Hence, the focus of day nursery services was to preserve the parent-child relationship and to restore the mother to her rightful place in the home. There was also special focus on the school-age child and the fear that she/he would become a juvenile delinquent if adequate supervision was not provided. To further enhance the theme that day care was supportive of family life, the classification of such services was altered.

The day nursery was now seen as a family service instead of a child welfare service. (Bogue and Moran, 1933: 118) While this may appear to be a superficial change, such a chance in classification was crucial to the social work profession.

In any event, another concern of some social workers was that mothers sought employment to avoid their child-rearing responsibilities. As Keiser states:

> Mothers should not send their children to the nursery every day while they report each morning for possible work at the dress factory or the laundry, securing only one or two days' work a week, with two or three dollars to show for it. This is less than the cost of the care of the children and, in the meantime, the mothers are entirely free of responsibility. (Keiser, 1936: 229)

Obviously, Keiser was also concerned about the cost-effectiveness of the day nursery to the funding source. Bogue (1931: 152) was also concerned about the costs of day care, and recommended that certain mothers be urged to remain at home. The cost of day care for mothers with two or more children exceeded the salary the mother could earn in the labor market. Instead, such mothers should be provided with a Mothers' Pension. However, not all mothers were eligible for these pensions until the 1935 enactment of Aid to Dependent Children. Bogue further stigmatized day nurseries by referring to them as "relief" agencies: "the difference between the fee paid by the mother and the actual cost of the child care in the nursery is, in effect, financial relief." (Bogue, 1931: 152)

In addition to the recurrent theme of cost effectiveness, other aspects of day nurseries appear to be constant. Home visits were still made to the families and mothers' meetings continued to be organized. (Bogue, 1931; Bogue and Moran, 1933; Tyson, 1935; Williamson, 1931) In regard to quality of care and licensing, only 21 states had any guidelines by 1933. (Bogue and Moran, 1933: 117) It was further recommended that states could increase their involvement beyond inspection and supervision of day nurseries and act as advocates for such services in various communities.

Foster Family Day Care. A new development in the delivery of day care services was the experimentation with foster family day care homes. Experimentation with such services was the result of a "needs assessment" survey conducted in Philadelphia in 1927. Discovering that mothers preferred day care provided by a friend or relative in a more home-like atmosphere, the "First Day Nursery of Philadelphia" sold its building and began to organize day-time "foster placement" of young children. Further, day nurseries were considered problematic because of the "(1) discrepancy between mother's hours of employment and hours when nurseries were open; (2) distance from the nursery; (3) problems presented by quarantine or nursery or infections and slight illnesses of child; (4) age limits imposed by the nursery." (Kenney, 1936: 3) Conversely, the foster family day care home had much more to offer. Children were placed in families who were generally of the same religious faith, the same nationality, and who had a similar standard of living. Not only was a foster day care home a less costly form of child care but it also "safeguards the child who suffers from a feeling of isolation from his own people." (LaGrange, 1929: 5)

However, as a result of the change in basic service delivery, fewer families received foster family day care services from the First Day Nursery of Philadelphia. In the first few years of operation, only 15 percent of all applicants were accepted into the program. (LaGrange, 1929 and 1930) In fact, if a mother had three or more children she was given a subsidy by the agency to remain at home. And, in certain cases, some of these mothers became foster day care mothers themselves. Once again, maternal employment was seen as an option of the last resort. In fact, there was some hostility expressed by some husbands because their wives had received day care services:

> Five out of six families who had able-bodied husbands we believe were actually harmed by our agency assuming supervision -- that is, the husband expressed himself at the end of the period as being satisfied at last that the responsibility for support lay with him and that we had not helped when we made it possible for his wife to work. (LaGrange, 1930: 2)

However, it is difficult to know whether these husbands truly resented the foster day care services or whether they felt somehow "inadequate" due to low wages or unemployment during the Depression.

Social casework was also an important aspect of this experiment in foster day care. Because so few families were accepted into the program, many referrals had to be made. In fact, about 25 percent of the applicants were referred to other social service agencies because of "family dysfunction." An additional 24 percent of the mothers were qualified for Mothers' Pensions and were thus refused day care.

Further, 36 percent of the families were refused care because of the presence of an able-bodied male breadwinner. (LaGrange, February, 1930: 2) While maternal employment was necessary because of the husband's low wages or unemployment, the family day care administrators considered this an inappropriate reason to qualify for services.

Despite the rhetoric of anti-maternal employment, the idea of foster family day care homes spread. Kenney (1933) reported that this form of day care was successful because it was more economical and had a smaller turnover of children than in the day nurseries. Other advantages of family day care homes were: better health of the children, better social casework, greater responsiveness to the mother's work schedule, and the possibility of caring for a wider age range of children. Lastly, children could be cared for in their own neighborhoods. Thus, "white collar families" could use the services of family day care homes.

Day Nurseries and the Mental Hygiene of Children. Beginning in the early 1930's, several social workers and day nursery professionals began to mention the value of working in conjunction with a child guidance clinic, a psychiatrist, or a psychologist. (Bogue and Moran, 1933; Williamson, 1931) This was a logical development in the functioning of day nurseries because so many children were viewed as coming from "maladjusted families." In addition, some children were sent to the day nursery because they displayed "behavior problems" which their parents were unable to handle. Conversely, Bogue and Moran (1933: 118) noted that "psychiatrists and social workers are also beginning to use nurseries for their therapeutic value in certain types of cases which involve maladjusted parent-child relations." In short, utilization of psychoanalytic theory in the delivery of day nursery services represented another step toward professionalization of the day nursery as a social service institution.

Writing in the Child Welfare League of America's Bulletin, Rademacher (1937) evaluated the day nursery from a psychiatric perspective. For a psychiatrist, Rademacher (1937: 3) espoused a rather non-traditional view of the working mother; he admired the working mother who "still has the fire to want to carry on and hold (her) own together if (she) can possibly do so." Rademacher (1937: 7) also conceptualized that the "ideal" day nursery would hire a number of different professionals in order to provide a well-rounded day nursery program. Such a program would include: a routine nursery school program and "occupational therapy" (job training) as well as recreation and hobby groups for the older children. Further, nutrition plans could be developed, growth studies would be conducted, and consultations with psychiatrists would be arranged to discuss the "problem" children.

One of the problems which would be prevalent among many of the children was adjustment to separation from parents. While this is a perfectly normal reaction of most children upon entrance to a day care center, Rademacher painted a rather grim picture: the child "will be lonely often and his heart nothing but an aching void. He will dwell on thoughts of his own martyrdom, or will become filled with a canker of false righteousness." (Rademacher, 1937: 7) With such a bleak rendering of the negative consequences of placing a child in a day nursery, it is obvious to see why the working mother was typified by him as a tragic heroine, at best, or a "wicked women," at worst, causing irreparable damage to her child. Thus, Rademacher probably viewed the working mother with professional condescension and a bit of "noblesse oblige." He concluded his article by supporting the prevailing ideology that a woman's place was in the home: "My ideal day nursery would really be the more sagacious and great maternal parent, solely guiding the children by day, and jointly taking hold with the other parent at night." (Rademacher, 1937: 7) If Rademacher's views were representative of the psychiatric profession as a whole, then one could assume that psychiatry became one more profession which contributed to the stigmatization of the day nursery.

Thus, focusing on the mental hygiene of children in the day nursery became a double-edged sword. On the one hand, concern for mental hygiene meant consultation with a psychiatrist or with the child guidance clinic. Yet in the process of developing a rationale for such a relationship, the day nursery and the working mother only became further stigmatized.

Additional articles on day nurseries in the late 1930's reiterated the same basic theme on the importance of professionalization of services and the emphasis on mental hygiene. (Lockwood, 1937; Lundberg, 1939; Moran, 1937; Pyke, 1936) In addition, one important change occurred which further supported the notion that the day nursery was a social service strategy. On December 28, 1935, the National Federation of Day Nurseries (N.F.D.N.) moved into the same offices with the Child Welfare League of America. In fact, both organizations would share the same executive director. (Child Welfare League of America Bulletin, January, 1936: 4) The article stated that both organizations would preserve their own "identities." However, this seems questionable, at best. Clearly, there would be mutual influence of philosophy and goals for each organization. One could even speculate that the Child Welfare League of America would have even more influence on the N.F.D.N. than vice versa because the other child welfare activities were less controversial than day care.

CHAPTER 4

Day Care and World War II, 1941 to 1946

The decade opened with the 1940 White House Conference entitled "Children in a Democracy." Unlike the previous decade, this conference did not address the issue of day care in any workshop. In fact, the provision of day care services did not become an issue until the following year.[1] It took the onset of another national crisis, World War II, to force government officials and the business community to be concerned about day care. And similar to the emergency nursery school program of the Depression years, the World War II day care centers were federally funded for reasons other than providing a community service for all working mothers. Further, industry's sponsorship of day care was considerably expanded during the war effort. (For explanation refer to Appendix C.)

The term "day care center" was first introduced during World War II because of the inclusion of school-aged children into the day nursery.

---

[1] With the increased demand for female labor, the need for day care became apparent.

> "A year ago (1942) one heard much more about the possibility through counseling of deterring young mothers from going to work. Today, partly because we have discovered that the woman who comes to us has already made up her mind, and partly because we feel pressed by the needs of industry, we talk less of this aspect of counseling." (Hosley, 1943: 2-3)

While the expansion of services aimed at children aged six to twelve was acceptable, the controvery surrounding infant day care still persisted. Consequently, the War Manpower Commission as well as the Children's Bureau developed policy statements in regard to working mothers with young children.

The purpose of this chapter is to examine two major issues. The first section explores social workers' attitudes toward working mothers. Symbolically, the working mother was thought to cause child neglect, juvenile delinquency, and other developmental problems in children. But substantively, many social workers recognized the reasons why mothers chose to work and acknowledged the need to provide care for their children. One reason why mothers chose to work was the increased wages offered in the Defense factories. As one social worker exclaimed, "Last year she worked for $12 a week in a laundry; this year for $50 a week in a defense factory!" (Hosley, 1943: 3) Secondly, the experience of poverty during the Depression years was still fresh in the minds of many women. Hence, work was sought as a way to ensure future economic security. Further, one of the consequences of the war was the potential death or disability of the father which might propel the mother into the workplace. However, social workers' support for day care stemmed from the concern for the children rather than providing a service which allowed mothers to work. In this manner, the profession remained within acceptable boundaries of social decorum and the dominant American ideology.

The second section of this chapter focuses on social workers' attitudes toward day care during the war. One of the most important aspects of providing such services during the war was to destigmatize the day care center as a form of charity. However, not all social workers were necessarily interested in establishing day care as a community service; rather, they sought to maintain the social service ideology.

Should Mothers of Young Children Work? Before embarking upon a discussion of the attitudes of social workers, toward day care, it is crucial to consider public opinion and professional attitudes toward working mothers. Prior to 1940, there was clear professional as well as public opposition to maternal employment. Only the most "unfortunate" of mothers were forced to seek jobs away from their homes and children. And the number of women pursuing their careers was minimal, at best. (Chafe, 1972)

However, with men gone off to the battlefields, the opposition to maternal employment was altered. Because the Defense plants needed additional employees, it suddenly became "patriotic" to work. (Frederickson, 1942) As the title of a book by Susan B. Anthony II states, Mothers Went Out of the Kitchen-Into the War. So pervasive was the publicity which encouraged women to seek jobs, that some social workers charged that industry was explicitly "luring" mothers away from their homes. As Guyler (1942: 445) stated:

> Some mothers will feel that separation from their homes and children is not possible, yet they may be burdened by conflict. We (social workers) will need to assure them that they can serve their country by remaining at home with their children.

As a result of the increasing number of working mothers, the Children's Bureau held a conference in 1941 specifically on this issue. Recommendations for provision of day care services were made, including the suggestion that federal and state agencies should exert leadership in developing such services. Secondly, it was recommended that counseling services be made available to mothers to ensure that they would make adequate child care plans. Thirdly, "nursery school" and "cooperative nursery groups" should be developed as community services and not be established at industrial sites. Lastly, comprehensive services should be developed to include: family day care homes, housekeeper services, day camps, vacation camps, and after-school services. (Women's Bureau, 1953: 23)

However, opposition to employment of mothers with young children was expressed at this conference, as well as in many journal articles. (Hosley, 1943; Melby, 1942; McCormick, 1943; Morton, 1943; Reeder, 1942) As one social worker stated, "It is a paradoxical situation -- we are taking women out of their homes, away from their children, to help win a war to assure a better world for the same children." (Reeder, 1942: 3) And as one journalist wrote, "No informed American needs a psychologist to tell him that children separated from home ties and without constant care...are the troublemakers, the neurotics and the spiritual and emotional cripples of a generation hence." (Chafe, 1972: 164) Lastly, some

78

social workers believed that these mothers sought employment as a way to abdicate responsibilities of home and children. "Entering industry may mean her chance to get away from a rejected child, from hated housework, from an unbearable marital situation; a chance to get away and at the same time feel that she is being patriotic." (Melby, 1942: 35) Social workers were particularly concerned about the long hours of employment as well as night-shift work. For example, according to Hosley (1943: 3), it was not uncommon for a mother to work seven days a week, 12 hours a day in a Defense factory. Furthermore, since mothers lacked seniority on the job, they were often assigned to the least desirable shifts, such as 11:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. (Murphy, 1943)

As a result of this vigorous opposition, the War Manpower Commission drafted a "Policy on Employment in Industry of Women with Young Children." This policy stated that "the first responsibility of women with young children, in war as in peace, is to give suitable care in their own homes to their children." (Women's Bureau, 1953: 25) Consequently, such mothers were to be employed as a last resort. In addition, the federal government continued to uphold the position that A.D.C. mothers should not work. Employment was discouraged because "the home was broken up after she had failed in her dual capacity (as a homemaker and wage earner) and the children had become delinquent or seriously neglected." As Hopkirk (May, 1942: 6) declared, "Indignation is a proper reaction wherever we find county officials shoving women off A.D.C. lists because they can obtain wartime jobs. The Social Security Act named children and not country treasuriers as beneficiaries of this type of service."

However, an A.D.C. mother could, of her own free will, decide to work. As Campbell (1943: 28) suggested, "many mothers eligible for public assistance may have preferred employment because it yielded a more comfortable living and carried with it none of the 'stigma' implicit to them in relief."

Opposition to maternal employment of women with infants and toddlers was even stronger. Essentially, it was feared that children under two would suffer from "personality problems" or "behavior disorders" if care was provided at a day nursery. (Dashiell and Keeley, 1944; Gesell, 1944; Ribble, 1944) Arguments similar to those used twenty years earlier were once again invoked. Ribble (1944) claimed that lack of breast feeding was a sign of maternal deprivation.[1] Gesell, a famous child psychologist, was in agreement with such thinking. If infants and toddlers were placed in a day nursery, the following problems might develop: reduced integration of "total behavior," reduced initiative, ineptness in new social situations, retardation in language development, and similar developmental problems. (Gesell, 1944: 10)

---

[1] "Breastfeeding is a requisite not only for healthy physical and nutritional development, but for the essential emotional relationship to the mother. I think it is not too strong a statement to say that every child who does not have this relationship for at least four months develops a sense of deprivation for which compensation is extremely difficult." (Ribble, 1944: 2)

---

during the day. Family day care homes were lauded for a variety of reasons. Not only did a day care home respond to the preferences of many parents but also provided a viable option for infant day care. In addition, they provided a home-like atmosphere for a small number of children and were located in the family's neighborhood. Because they were smaller than a day nursery, they could also be more responsive to the mother's work schedule. And casework services were necessary because not all families could be accepted into the program. Consequently, referrals had to be made to other social services, including Aid to Dependent Children.

The second new development during the Depression was the concern for the "mental hygiene" of children in day care. Many children were now being referred to day care because they displayed behavior problems which their parents could not handle effectively. Another concern was how to address the "separation anxiety" experienced by the children in the day nursery. Hence, the working mother was once again charged with "neglecting" her child and even causing "psychological damage." Thus the day nursery was not viewed as freeing the mother for employment but rather as a therapeutic tool of intervention for "problem" children or "seriously deprived" children. In short, the value of casework for the day nursery was still considered paramount, especially if such services were to be accepted as a credible field of social work practice.

However, many of these attitudes and ideologies toward working mothers and their children would be somewhat altered during World War II.

However, the problem with both of these opinions was that they were based on Ribble's and Gesell's observations of children in orphanages. While a day care center and an orphanage might have appeared to have many commonalities, these two child care experts seem to overlook the fact that the day nursery provided pre-school education, games, and activities and that the child returned home in the evening. However, arguments suggesting that quality of time spent with the child were not advocated in the 1940's. Hence, orphanages were equated to day nurseries through the observations of biased experts.

In response to this concern for infants and toddlers, the Children's Bureau held a special conference in 1944. (Children's Bureau, 1945; Women's Bureau, 1953: 28) Agreeing with the child care experts who opposed day care for children under age two, the Children's Bureau recommended that foster family day care homes should be established. Such care was viewed as more individualized and better suited to the developmental needs of infants and toddlers. Also suggested was the establishment of a "homemaker service." A "visting mother" would be sent into the home to provide day care for children who did not adjust well to group activities or who had special needs. (Frederickson, 1944: 164) However, the major problem with this social service was its exorbitant cost.

As a result of all this opposition to maternal employment, other options were recommended so that mothers of preschool children did not have to work. Mayo (1943: 131) suggested that:

> ...Minority groups, men over 50 years of age, and other potential workers who are still ignored in some communities must be utilized to the full in order to permit the mothers of young children to carry on their highly important functions in the home.

He also recommended implementation of a 48-hour work week which would be preferable to asking mothers to work. Additional suggestions included part-time employment, job sharing, and transporting needed male workers to cities with the greatest demand for labor. (Hosley, 1943; Frederickson, 1942) However, these options seemed less feasible than hiring mothers of young children. And in the end, demands for female labor were so great that the establishment of day care centers was inevitable. (Close, 1943)

Social Workers' Attitudes Toward World War II Day Care. Before embarking upon a discussion of the attitude of social workers toward the day care centers, one interesting development occurred. As foreshadowed in 1936, the National Federation of Day Nurseries was dissolved in the end of 1942 and absorbed into the Child Welfare League of America. (Ijams, 1942: 8) Writing in the CWLA Bulletin, Hopkirk (1942b: 8) explained that the League had been interested in this field of child welfare for many years. Hence, the consolidation of organizations represented an "expansion" of services rather than the assumption of new ones. Essentially, the CWLA would be responsible to: develop standards of care, train personnel, aid in community planning for the development of services, and provide technical assistance to local, state, and federal agencies. One can speculate that since the two organizations had the same executive director for six years that this "expansion of services" was not terribly difficult. Further, the provision of day care services were now more clearly affiliated with the social work profession.

In any event, the attitudes of social workers toward day care was a variation on several basic themes. Many practitioners continued to define these services, so that the conceptualization of day care increased in complexity. From a self-help service for "worthy" or "normal" families, to a child welfare service, to a family service, day care was now defined as defying "precise classification." As Mayo (1943: 166) contended, day care "cannot be tagged and filed away neatly in an orthodox manner under the caption of 'case work,' 'group work,' or 'community organization.' It is closely related to public health, education, and industry, and it deals with a wide variety of groups in the community some of which have had no previous contact with social work or social workers." Such a conceptualization of services reflected the increased need for day care as a *community* social service for normal families, rather than as a *social work* intervention strategy for *maladjusted* families.

However, the stigma attached to day care was not easily cast aside. Hence, one of the important challenges to social workers was to somehow de-stigmatize service delivery. (Close, 1943; Guyler, 1942; McCormick, 1943; Sherman, 1943) The necessity of de-stigmatization demonstrated that social workers wanted to ensure good care for the children of working mothers as opposed to inadequate or haphazard arrangements. Many parents were reluctant to come to a social work agency to arrange for services lest "other people" think that they needed to receive "charity." Clearly, federal funds were necessary to respond to the need for day care, but it would achieve few benefits to develop services that would not be used.

The solution was to establish a central "in-take bureau" located in a public building to process all applications. However, not all social work agencies initially established such services. The result was that social work consultation was not utilized to arrange for child care services. As described by Guyler (1942: 443), when consultation services were housed in the casework agency, "its best bet may be to send its consultation staff with quick dispatch to a different building, with a new sign on the door." Obviously, de-stigmatization of services was an essential ingredient for utilization. As recommended by another social worker:

> It was felt extremely important that the bureau be housed in a public building where as many as possible potential workers in industry might be made aware of the services being offered by the child care center. It was considered equally as important that the bureau be located at a place holding no implications of relief or charity.
> (Sherman, 1943: 5)

Many such central intake bureaus were established at the local U.S. Employment Service office. In this fashion, mothers of young children could easily be referred to the "family consultant" to discuss their day care plans. However, some mothers did not always care to discuss their child care plans with an "outside party." (Sherman, 1942) In short, the social work consultant was viewed as a public intruder into a private decision.

While some social workers were interested in de-stigmatizing day care services to increase utilization, other social workers were still interested in maintaining them as a social service strategy. (Campbell, 1943; Dashiell, April, 1943; Farnum, 1944; Rawley, 1943; Voiland, 1942) Caseworkers were still concerned about assessment of family dynamics such as mother-child separation problems, the working mother's impact on the husband's ego, and the capacity of the mother to bear the dual burden of work and household maintenance. For example, Campbell (1943: 30) suggested that some mothers feared the loss of love from their child or felt guilty about "deserting" their child. Another important aspect of casework was to hold case conferences with the teaching staff to discuss the children's adjustment to the day care center as well as parental reactions and concerns.

Moreover, some social workers still viewed federal support of services as a temporary measure, at best:

> Since the conversation of stable family life is the basis of our democracy, it follows that care which is given to children away from normal home influence and training must be undertaken only after serious consideration of all the factors involved, and should, in most cases, be looked upon as a temporary plan. (Ruegg, 1942: 8)

The last major concern of social workers during World War II was the opposition to custodial day care. Since the demand for female labor was high and the waiting lists for day care centers were long, social workers feared that children would be "warehoused" in large numbers in an inadequate environment. As Melby (1942: 35) stated, "Knowing how destructive wholesale plans for the care of young children may be, can we afford not to use, with ever more skill, thoughtfully worked out casework methods?" Further, the educational component in day care became more important in order to rationalize the existence of the centers.

Despite all the controversy over establishing day care services, funds from the Lanham Act were used to establish over 3,000 day care centers for approximately 100,000 children by July, 1944. (See Appendix C for details) In addition, many day care centers were sponsored by business and industry. Clearly, the demand for female labor exceeded the opposition to maternal employment during World War II.

Summary and Conclusions

From a social policy perspective, there is much to be learned from a historical analysis of day care. One important discovery is the lengthy tradition behind the conflicting goals and objectives as currently stated for day care. For example, when the 1962 welfare amendments were enacted, day care was provided to AFDC mothers to allow them to work and in turn reduce their dependency on welfare. This marked a change in philosophy from the original intent of the program, which was created to allow women to remain in their "proper place" in the home. In fact, these amendments reflected the philanthropic philosophy of the late nineteenth century. A second contemporary goal of day care is to break the "cycle of poverty" by providing medical care, compensatory education, and nutritious meals for the children. A third goal of current day care policy is to emphasize the cognitive development of young children. This goal became particularly important after 1920. Once again, the origins of these goals date back to the late nineteenth century when day care was seen as "preventive philanthropy" or as a mechanism to achieve social justice.

A second important finding in the historical analysis of day care is the impact of the social work profession on the delivery of day care services. Historically, day care has been stigmatized because only poor, unfortunate mothers entered the labor force. Secondly, day care has been stigmatized because of its philanthropic origins. Indeed, it has taken nearly a century to de-stigmatize both the concept of working mothers as well as day care centers.

A second aspect of social work involvement in day care is the simultaneous achievement of goals for the institution of day care as well as the profession of social work. In other words, there was a positive correlation between the increase in day nurseries and the expanded role for social workers. In fact, social workers used the day nursery as an institution in which to define their unique professional skills and abilities. In turn, this professionalization aided the viability of the day nursery in an era when maternal employment was the exception rather than the rule.

A third aspect of this historical analysis is the cluster of basic themes which appear between 1890 and 1946. One very important theme is the causation of poverty as interpreted by the charity organization movement, the settlement house workers, and eventually social workers. Further. the causes of poverty were also closely linked to notions about human nature, social decorum, and the prerequisites for a stable society. Of particular importance was the "proper place" of women in both the family and society. A second important theme was the concept of philanthropy, including charity giving, social reform, and eventually social work practice. Clearly, the definition of problems and their resolution was influenced by the nature of intervention into people's lives. The charity workers were interested in separating the "worthy" from the "unworthy" poor and emphasized individual moral reform. Conversely, the settlement workers were interested in the external causes of poverty and the achievement of social justice. Eventually, the philosophies of both groups provided the basis for the social work profession, which was seen as a more sophisticated and scientific mode of intervention into people's lives.

A third theme focuses on the conceptualization of day care as a social service strategy. By "social service strategy" it is meant that the social work profession has used day care as a strategy of intervention into low-income households with "unfortunate circumstances" or poor families with working mothers. Consequently, day care was initially conceptualized as a self-help strategy for the poor. Later, the social work profession would define day care as a child welfare service in the 1920's, a family service in the 1930's, and a community social service during World War II. Related to this theme of day care as a social service strategy are the funding auspices of day care from 1890 to 1946. Initially financed by charities and settlement houses, day care services ultimately received federal funds during the Depression years and World War II. With the entrance of the federal government into the supply of day care, additional goals and objectives evolved.

What else can be learned from a historical analysis of social work influence on day care from 1890 to 1946? One of the most important aspects of such an analysis is the understanding of why many social workers felt that casework was an essential component of day care delivery.

Not only have social workers attempted to ensure that the day care center is an appropriate arrangement for child care but also they attempted to determine that mothers entered the work force because there was no other viable alternative. The basis of this role in day care delivery can be traced back to the late nineteenth century.

During the Progressive Era, both the settlement house workers and the charity workers sponsored day nurseries, each for different reasons. For the charity organization workers, day nurseries represented a community-based alternative to orphanages, where children of working mothers were often sent. Further, according to the charity organization ideology, work was acceptable for mothers who were widowed or deserted. Accordingly, the willingness to work was a sign of worthiness. For the settlement house workers, day nurseries were established to help the mothers of recently arrived immigrant or urban migrant families. Acknowledging the external causes of poverty, settlement house workers accepted the need to have two wage earners in the family in order to survive.

Yet, the establishment of day nurseries generated a great deal of controversy. Advocates argued that the day nursery prevented the institutionalization of young children and thus preserved the family unit. Further, the day nursery offered a child care environment which was superior to that of the child's own home. Hence, the day nursery was "character building" and could help break the "cycle of poverty" by instilling the proper virtues in future citizens. In short, the day nursery embodied a strategy of "preventive philanthropy."

Perhaps the most sensitive attack on the day nursery was that it "lured" mothers from their "proper place" in the home. In an effort to allow "deserving" mothers to remain at home, Mothers' Pensions were created by two states in 1911. By 1921, forty states had enacted similar programs. (Bell, 1965) Yet not all mothers were eligible for pensions; often work was the only way to survive for many mothers. However, one of the unintended consequences of Mothers' Pensions was to brand the day nursery as a less desirable form of charity.

At the same time, the stigmatization of day care provided the rationale for further social work involvement in the delivery of services. While day nurseries were spreading across the country, social workers were affiliating themselves with various institutions in an effort to define their unique professional skills. Thus social work came to be defined in an inductive manner: the profession was the sum total of all activities done by social workers while mediating between the individual in the institution and the larger social environment.

Thus, the role of the social workers was crucial if the day nursery was to survive as a viable charitable institution. Social workers could offer a "social diagnosis" of the mother applying for day care services to determine whether the family's situation was acute or chronic and whether they were known to other charitable organizations. Further, the caseworker could also attempt to discourage the mother from entering the labor force. Budget readjustments were recommended because caseworkers assumed that money was being spent on unnecessary items. Further, the day nursery was often established as a "multi-service center" for the entire family, providing health care, parent education, and attention to other family concerns.

Another unintended consequence of continued social work involvement in the day nursery was the increased stigmatization of services: day care was for low-income, maladjusted families. This stigmatization would adhere until the early 1940's. As social workers attempted to guarantee the viability of the day nursery through the provision of casework services, critics of the 1920's charged that an institution which existed solely to allow mothers to work was doomed for failure. Hence, a second option to guarantee the future of the day nursery was the inclusion of an educational component. This issue was critical because the nursery school movement, which stressed pre-school education, offered a serious challenge to the day nurseries. In addition, many nursery schools remained open a full day which provided middle-class mothers with an acceptable child care alternative to the day nursery, which was branded as charity.

The onset of the Depression marked the first time that day care services were not funded solely as a social service strategy. Rather, the primary purpose for federal funds was to provide jobs for unemployed teachers, nurses, janitors, and nutritionists. A secondary goal of the program was to provide care and education for children from "economically deprived" homes. Thus, day care services were not funded during the

Depression solely to care for children whose mothers worked. In fact, in an era of high unemployment, maternal labor force participation was discouraged because a woman's "proper place" was in the home.

Another program consistent with the dominant American ideology toward women was also created during the Depression era. Mothers' Pensions were expanded, supported by federal funds, and renamed "Aid to Dependent Children." Recognizing that Mothers' Pensions had been underfunded by the states as well as ineffectively administered, advocates of Aid to Dependent Children sought to create a program for female-headed households who were not eligible for other government-sponsored work programs or other forms of social insurance.

Further, many social workers continued to oppose maternal employment during the Depression. If a mother worked, those social workers saw employment as a "temporary measure" until the mother could be restored to her "proper place" in the home. In fact, these social workers charged that mothers sought employment as a way to avoid child-rearing responsibilities. Further, they argued that if the mother had two or more children the cost of day care would exceed her salary. However, not all social workers opposed working mothers during the Depression; many acknowledged the need for two incomes as necessary for survival.

In any event, two new aspects emerged in the delivery of day care services in the 1930's: family day care homes and a professional concern for the "mental hygiene" of children separated from their mothers

Entrance into the war marked the largest number of mothers to enter the work force to date. Whereas working mothers were previously viewed as deviant, the demand for female labor made employment not only acceptable but also patriotic. Initially resistant to the idea of maternal employment, social workers charged that the Defense industries were "luring" women away from their domestic responsibilities. Once again, working mothers were charged with causing juvenile delinquency, personality problems, behavior disorders, and other developmental problems in children. Further, some child psychologists were equating day care centers with orphanages which only contributed to stigmatization of services.

However, with the poverty of the Depression years still fresh in their minds as well as the incentive of increased salaries, many mothers decided to enter the labor force. Ultimately, the War Manpower Commission developed a policy which stated that mothers of young children were to be employed as a "last resort." The Children's Bureau also developed a policy statement recommending family day care homes for children under age two. Finally, funds for day care centers were made available through the Lanham Act because the demand for female labor outweighed the protests by professionals.

Consequently, the challenge to the social work profession during World War II was to de-stigmatize the day care center as a charitable institution. If this was not achieved, haphazard child care arrangements might be made because kin were less available for child care. Thus central in-take bureaus were created and located in public buildings.

Eventually, an entire range of programs for preschool and school-aged children were established. Over 8,700 centers cared for nearly 320,000 children during the war. However, the notion that day care was funded as a "win-the war" program prevailed. After the war ended, federal funds were stopped despite all efforts to the contrary.

Today, many social workers still see the value of day care as a social service strategy. However, the bulk of services are provided as a "social utility" for families with working mothers. Yet as indicated in the National Study of Social Services to Children and Their Families (Shyne & Schroeder, 1978) there are a significant number of children referred to day care whose mothers are not employed or in school. For such children, what is the responsibility of the day care center and the welfare department? Who should ensure that both the children and the parents are receiving the necessary therapy and supportive services? Answers to these questions and further research on these issues is imperative if the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is to develop guidelines for day care which respond to the special social service needs of some children and their families.

PUBLIC POLICY AND CONFLICTING GOALS FOR DAY CARE
1890 to 1990

Wendy Gray
Wellesley College Center for Research on Women

Do Not Reproduce
Without Author's
Permission

CONFLICTING GOALS	1890	1910	1920	1930	1940	1960	1970	1980
Day Care as a Child Development Program	-cleanliness -obedience -industriousness	→	Introduction of early childhood education	Compensatory intervention	Child development	Compensatory education Cognitive growth and development	→	→
Day Care as a Social Service Strategy	Day care as: -a self-help strategy -strategy to end pauperism	→	Casework for "unfortunate" families	Mental hygiene of children	Destigmatize the day care center	Day care can break the "cycle of poverty"	Child & Family Services Act, 1974 and 1975	→
			The day nursery as a multi-purpose center	→	→	F.I.D.C.R.: social workers at day care centers	→	H.H.S.D.C.R. information referral follow-up
Day Care as Social Utility	╳	╳	Full day nursery schools	╳	Support for "patriotic" mothers	Day care for "normal" families	-CCDA, 1971 -Child Care Act of 1979 -I.R.S. Income tax deduction	Proposal (HR 8109) to increase tax deduction benefits
PUBLIC POLICY AS THE IMPLEMENTATION OF GOALS								
Public Policy	╳	Mothers' pensions	→	-Works Progress Administration: jobs for the unemployed -A.D.C.	Lanham Act: win the war	A.D.C. and W.I.N.	Title XX	→
THE "SOCIAL CONTEXT" OF MOTHERHOOD								
Role of the Mother	"Worthy" mother worked	"Worthy" mother remained at home	→	→	"Patriotic" mother worked	AFDC mothers & independence	→	→
						"Liberated" mother worked	→	→

APPENDICES

A. Research on Day Nurseries, 1919 to 1929 91

B. Federal Policy on Day Care Services 94

1. During World War I

2. During the Depression Years, 1930 to 1940

C. Day Care Services During World War II 101

1. Assessing the Need for Day Care

2. Reorganizing the Works Progress Administration

3. The Politics of the Lanham Act

4. Industrial Day Care Centers

5. Additional Legislative Attempts

APPENDIX A: RESEARCH ON DAY NURSERIES, 1919 to 1929

As social workers increasingly professionalized day nurseries, empirical data were gathered through social investigations. Some day nurseries were used as laboratories to discover the "causes and extent of the entrance of mothers into industry, and the effects on the home life of the family." (Colbourne, 1920: 129). One study conducted by Helen Tyson in Philadelphia in 1919 pointed out that few working mothers used day nurseries. Given the stigma of such services as well as strict admissions requirements, this finding is hardly surprising.

However, Tyson's study did remind social workers of certain important aspects of maternal employment:

> In an effort to fasten the blame for this sweeping change in the part the mother plays in home care and child training, superficial thinkers are apt to condemn the day nursery. They forget that the day nursery is an effect, not a cause; that in city communities the old-time home life has broken down; that mothers worked outside the home long before nurseries came into existence, and that only a relatively small group of working mothers, out of the whole number avail themselves of nursery care. (Colbourne, 1920: 129.)

Tyson had evaluated 864 mothers who used the day nursery. Thirty percent were widows; thirty-nine percent were deserted, separated, or divorced; thirty percent were married with husband present; and one percent were unmarried mothers. (Colbourne, 1920: 129.) It should be noted that the only positive change in day nursery policy from 1919 to 1930 was the admission of illegitimate children as well as school-age children up to age twelve.

However, Tyson fully supported the casework approach to day nursery work:

> The day nursery's obligation is not discharged until every family under its care has been restored, as nearly as possible, that normal home life on which our modern society was founded. (Colbourne, 1920: 129.)

Tyson concludes her study by commenting on the future of the day nursery.

> The nursery that is satisfied simply with furnishing routine physical care to its little charges will doubtless soon cease to arouse community interest and support, and will soon join the orphan asylum in its passage toward oblivion. But the nursery that is progressive enough to study community needs and to work out its own part in meeting them, will be recognized more widely as a conservator of the true values of home life. (Colbourne, 1920: 129-130.)

In sum, Tyson advocates for the professionalization of the day nursery as a child welfare agency. As a social service, the day nursery would not undermine the home because it would not admit just any child of a working mother. Further, the staff would work with each family in an effort to restore them to a "normal" home life.

In projecting into the future, Tyson acknowledged the opinions of the women in England's Labor Party. These women felt that the "poverty" day nursery may one day pave the way for the "neighborhood" nursery. "Its organization should be democratic rather than philanthropic; it would be open to all children of the neighborhood and located for the convenience of the mother..." (Colbourne, 1920: 129.) However, these women did acknowledge that it was important to initially provide day nurseries for children with the greatest economic need.

Tyson appeared to have an awareness that working mothers were not necessarily "abnormal" and that day nurseries did not contribute to the increase in maternal employment. Conversely, while stating that the day nursery is "conservator of the true values of home life" at the same time it was the day nursery's obligation to restore the family to "normality." By implication, Tyson is either contributing to the stigmatization of the day nursery or symbolically supporting the existing social work rhetoric.

Tyson conducted a similar survey in 1924, but examined all the day nurseries in Pennsylvania. (Colbourne, 1925.) Despite the existence of Mothers' Pensions, the demand for day nurseries had actually increased according to her study. Mothers' Pensions had resulted in a change in the type of mothers using such services. Tyson declared that the day nursery had become "the catch-all in cases of desertion, non-support, unemployment, sickness, etc." Of the 931 families in the study, 89 percent of the children came from a "disrupted" home.

Colbourne (1925) also reported a similar study conducted by the New York Academy of Medicine. The results of their study indicated that the demand for day nurseries had actually decreased. But Colbourne noted that the study was biased because it surveyed only eleven of the 112 day nurseries in New York City. In fact, the number of day nurseries had continued to expand nationwide.

APPENDIX B: FEDERAL POLICY AND DAY CARE DELIVERY

A critical issue following the Progressive era was the non-impact of World War I on government sponsorship of day nurseries. "Circumstantial evidence strongly suggests the federal government did not entertain aiding or establishing day care centers for mothers in war production." (Greenblatt, 1977: 39; see also Devine, 1910: 34 for discussion of publicly financed day nurseries.) However, the war effort did increase opportunities for women in industry. As described by Dorothy Worthington (1918: 229), of the Cleveland Day Nursery Association, mothers were "tempted by high wages and the novelty of factory work (but) were leaving their children on the streets or with some woman in the vicinity who was conducting a so-called 'home nursery.'" Hence, it was up to the philanthropic organizations to provide quality day care. Such nurseries were also perceived as better than those sponsored by industry which were without adequate supervision or play space. (Whipple, 1929: 89; Worthington, 1918: 230.)

The Depression was crucial to the development of day care services because it marked the first time that federal funds were provided. However, the aim of the Federal Emergency Relief Administration (F.E.R.A.) was not to provide services to working mothers, but instead to create jobs for unemployed teachers, nurses, nutritionists, and janitors. (Davis, 1935; Greenblatt, 1977; Steinfels, 1973.)

Kadushin (1974: 339) maintains that the day nurseries were also created to provide a healthier environment for poor children.

Implemented in 1933, the F.E.R.A. opened up "emergency nursery schools" to achieve four major purposes: "(a) to restore unemployed teachers and allied workers to socially useful service; (b) to develop the physical and mental well-being of preschool children in needy, under-privileged families; (c) to assist parents in meeting the nutritional, physical and social needs of their children; and (d) to set up an environment and daily program appropriate for preschool children as a demonstration for schools, homes, and welfare agencies." (Davis, 1935: 334.) The term "emergency nursery school" was employed when, in fact, these schools were generally open seven hours per day, from 8:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. However, Greenblatt (1977: 55) suggests that the distinction between the nursery school and the day nursery was sufficiently blurred to have created confusion in the program data. Further, since the Office of Education was responsible for the administration of the program, along with the F.E.R.A., it was more likely that the preschool program would be referred to as a "nursery school" rather than a day nursery.

Regardless of the confusion in terminology, the F.E.R.A. established 2,979 nursery schools from 1933 to 1934. Approximately 65,000 children were enrolled in this program. (Davis, 1935; Meek, 1937.) Children aged two to "school age" who were from needy or unemployed families were eligible. Also, children who were suffering from malnutrition or various illnesses were accepted into the nursery schools. (National Advisory Committee on Emergency Nursery Schools or N.A.C.E.N.S., 1938: 16.)

These emergency nursery schools were established all over the country; in both urban and rural areas, on Indian reservations, in mining camps, and even for migrant workers. They were located in a variety of different buildings: (1) within existing elementary schools; (2) within high schools and in conjunction with courses on child care; and (3) in connection with universities and as placements for student teachers. However, many programs required that a building be constructed to house the nursery school. This was perfectly acceptable to the F.E.R.A. because it created jobs for construction workers. (N.A.C.E.N.S., 1938: 16-26.)

However, not all children who attended the emergency nursery schools were "on relief." According to N.A.C.E.N.S., the average state enrollment of children on relief was about six percent. However, the range varied greatly from state to state: in Mississippi only .09 percent of needy children received such services whereas 57 percent of Idaho's needy children were in the nursery schools. Hence, there seem to be a rather large discrepancy between the level of need in each state and the number of needy children receiving such services. Among the more responsive states included Florida, Kentucky, and West Virginia. (N.A.C.E.N.S., 1938: 26.) Thus, many previously "middle class" children were enrolled in these programs, as indicated by the father's occupation. (See Table 1 on following page.) Furthermore, many of these nursery schools developed more flexible admissions policies if they were not filled to capacity. Many children were accepted whose mothers were looking for a job or who worked part-time or irregularly. In addition, children whose mothers were unemployed were often accepted if the mother was "anxious, worried or harassed because of continued economic insecurity." (Meek, 1935: 2.)

The personnel for the emergency nursery schools were taken primarily from the relief rolls. Initially, women with little or no college training were given one or two months' training and then placed in a classroom. (Greenblatt, 1977: 55; Meek, 1935: 2.) However, for the 1934-5 funding year there was a reduction in the number of emergency nursery schools: from 2,979 to 1,913; therefore the less qualified personnel lost their jobs. Apparently, the politics of the F.E.R.A., which soon was subsumed under the Works Progress Administration, created a number of administrative problems. For example, the W.P.A. dealt directly with local school boards in establishing the emergency nursery schools, and thus by-passed federal and state bureaucracies. To further complicate the matter, there was competition among the national bureaucracies as to which organization should be responsible for the program. Ultimately, the W.P.A. was designated as the funding agency, the Office of Education was authorized to approve local plans for the schools, and the Children's Bureau was left out entirely. (Greenblatt, 1977: 56.) Furthermore, the W.P.A. also ignored the advice of the education profession in developing the emergency nursery schools. Hence, the National Education Association charged the federal government with attempting to take over the schools. (Cremin, 1964: 323.)

TABLE I

Occupation of Father and Utilization
of Emergency Nursery Schools, 1933-4*

Occupation of Father	Percentage of Children in Emergency Nursery Schools
Day laborer	26.9%
Semi-skilled and minor clerical occupations	22.8
Slightly skilled occupations	20.1
Clerical skilled trades, retail businessmen	15.9
Farmers	8.7
Professionals	3.4
Semi-professionals and managerial	2.2

*National Advisory Committee on Emergency Nursery Schools. Emergency Nursery Schools During the First Year, 1933-34. Washington: Works Progress Administration, 1938, 40.

Despite these administrative difficulties, the emergency nursery schools were lauded for their accomplishments. The N.A.C.E.N.S. report (1938: 9) claimed that the nursery schools were developed "as a means of combating the physical and mental handicaps being imposed on young children by conditions incident to current economic and social difficulties." In fact, this report was written to appear as if the primary purpose of the project was to benefit young children rather than to provide jobs for the unemployed. Further, many children benefitted from the nursery school because they often lived in "unwholesome surroundings" and were removed "for certain hours of the day from overcrowding and the economic stress apparent in many of their homes." (N.A.C.E.N.S., 1938: 35.) Lastly, the nursery school was espoused as minimizing the future development of juvenile delinquency. "Proof is now available that delinquency among children in these disadvantaged families is less frequent when the children and the family have received the training which nursery schools give." (Davis, 1935: 335.)

Not only did the children gain from the nursery school experience but their families also derived benefits. Parent education and participation were stressed as important components of the program. Apparently, many parents were concerned about the "inadequacy" of their own home environments, which were relieved by the positive environment of the nursery school. Further, many parents received training in health care, feeding, and habit training of young children. Some parents even became an integral part of the nursery school functioning:

> Mothers washed clothes and blankets, sewed curtains and made doll clothes, scrubbed and cleaned school rooms, cooked meals and washed dishes. Fathers painted furniture, made toys, improved school grounds and built and repaired equipment. (N.A.C.E.N.S. 1938: 29.)

In short, many parents received training in child care, and were provided with activities to "boost their morale."

Lastly, many of the emergency nursery schools also functioned as multiservice centers. (Meek, 1935 and 1937; Tyson, 1935.) Meek (1937: 346) went so far as to state that the nursery schools were "the first public education program to integrate health, education, and mental hygiene and to plan the services in terms of home conditions and family needs." Additional services which were often available included: employment services, counseling, health services, and programs for school-age children, such as school lunches or girl scout troops.

Public opinion of the nursery schools varied, but newspaper articles generally reflected favorable attitudes. Local administrators of the program were also supportive of the nursery schools, but most were unable to continue the program without federal financing. For some communities, the emergency nursery schools were their first experience with early childhood education. Hence, popular community support was often hard to achieve. Lastly, most of the local schools were disinterested in maintaining the program once the W.P.A. program was terminated around 1937. Goody Koontz, et al. (1947: 60-1) suggested that this may have reflected an absence of vested interest in these programs, especially if funds would not be forthcoming. Again, early childhood education in the 1930's was not as popular or prevalent as it is currently perceived. Only the Los Angeles public schools continued to offer day care services throughout the Depression. (Smith, 1936: 7)

In sum, the emergency nursery schools benefitted a large number of children, even if they were funded to provide jobs for unemployed adults. While the program was initially frought with bureaucratic competition, these problems appeared to have subsided over time. And the impact of the Depression on popular conceptions of unemployment helped somewhat to de-stigmatize working mothers.

APPENDIX C: DAY CARE DURING WORLD WAR II

The Need for Day Care. Given the conflict surrounding working mothers and the need for day care, the Roosevelt administration initially insisted that such responsibility rested with each local community. Finally, $400,000 was allocated in the summer of 1942 to allow communities to survey their need for day care. (Chafe, 1972: 165-6.)

Given the demand for labor during World War II, the lack of child care facilities affected war production in many cities. Mothers were unwilling to work on Saturdays or during the summer when their children were not in school. Further, the absence of adequate child care facilities also contributed to high turnover rates and/or absenteeism. Thus employers were clearly interested in the establishment of child care centers to minimize their personnel problems. Yet only a few industries opened their own day care centers.

By surveying the various communities, it was discovered that parents usually made child care arrangements with their relatives or friends. Yet, many people were unavailable to provide day care because they, too, were working in defense factories -- even the grandmothers! Hence, hiring a domestic was the only other option. (Guyler, 1942; McCormick, 1943; Sherman, 1943.) One can speculate that women previously employed as domestics or foster day care mothers no longer engaged in such jobs if they could obtain higher wages by working in a Defense factory.

Yet, in some communities there was the feeling that because the local Defense industry paid such high wages, that mothers could financially afford to make their own child care arrangements. Therefore, the role of the *state* government should be to help local communities organize their day care services. In addition, the government could inform communities about the future expansion of various industries so that they could plan to create adequate child care facilities. (Reeder, 1942.) The problem with such a recommendation was that it did not acknowledge the high cost of *quality* day care, which means a low teacher-child ratio, good equipment, and college-educated personnel.

Meeting with a group of parents in Providence, Rhode Island, McCormick (1943) discovered that community support and financing was *expected* to be provided. The mothers' attitudes were that "if they fulfilled their patriotic duty of working in a war industry, it was up to the community to look after their children." (McCormick, 1943: 8.) In fact, these parents recommended a *downward* extension of the public schools. Similar meetings with parents in other communities reflect essentially the same sentiments. (Bragdon, 1943; Morton, 1943; Reeder, 1942.) Consequently, many social welfare planning councils began to survey the needs of working mothers in the community and established day care centers if "community chest" funds were available. (Hopkirk, 1943; Sheldon, 1942.) But the same message was conveyed: day care centers were desperately needed, especially to avoid inadequate child care arrangements or outright neglect, such as leaving children in locked cars in the factory parking lot.

Reorganizing the Works Progress Administration. When thinking about World War II day care centers, it is not uncommon to immediately refer to the Lanham Act. However, prior to the establishment of day care centers through this program, the W.P.A. program of emergency nursery schools was revived. In July, 1942, the W.P.A. was given $6 million to reorganize the nursery schools to serve the needs of working mothers. (Greenblatt, 1977: 58; Swan, 1970: 5) The entire operation was to be coordinated by the War Manpower Commission. In turn, the W.P.A., the Children's Bureau, and the Office of Education were assigned various tasks and coordinated by the Office of Defense, Health and Welfare Services within the War Manpower Commission. (Mayo, 1943)

As will be recalled, the Children's Bureau conference of 1941 was opposed to the employment of mothers with young children. However, the War Manpower Commission did not agree with the Children's Bureau and issued a policy statement in support of maternal employment. Thus, competitive bureaucratic rivalries were once again rekindled.

In fact, the Children's Bureau was given a very small role in developing the World War II day care centers. This agency was responsible for the development of child care centers by social work agencies, settlement houses, and other social service agencies. The Office of Education was assigned to develop the necessary facilities within the public schools. However, 95 percent of all day care centers came under school auspices as a result of all the new school buildings constructed by the W.P.A. in the 1930's. Thus, the Children's Bureau was left with the remaining five percent of the programs to administer. (Greenblatt, 1977) In addition to these administrative problems, the funds allocated to the W.P.A. were exhausted by the following summer (1943) as mothers continued to enter the labor force in ever-increasing numbers. (Swan, 1970)

The Politics of the Lanham Act. In preparation for entrance into the war, several new defense plants were constructed. Consequently, many people began to migrate to those cities with new job opportunities. For example, Detroit experienced a 13 percent increase in its population between 1941 and 1943 as a result of industrial growth. (Murphy, 1943) As migration to cities continued to rise, an acute shortage of adequate housing occurred. In order to respond to this dilemma, Representative Fritz Lanham introduced a bill into Congress. Entitled the "Defense Housing Act of 1940," federal monies were provided for the construction of housing. Included in this legislation was a clause which provided for the construction of public works.

"Public works" were defined to include schools, water works, sewers and sewage disposal, water purification, hospitals, recreational facilities, and streets. However, the Lanham Act never was created to provide funds for the construction of day care centers. But the definition of public works was stretched as day care advocates argued that the centers were close enough to being considered as "schools" and/or "recreational facilities." One advocate even went so far as to argue that they were "a home away from home." (Swan, 1970: 4)

And apparently an influential article in the Washington Post, supporting the need for day care services, helped to expedite the reinterpretation of the public works clause to include day care centers. (Greenblatt, 1977: 58; Kadushin, 1973: 305)

However, once the Lanham Act funds were made available, the confusion had just begun. Local officials encountered a bureaucratic maze because seven different agencies were involved in program administration.

> Lanham Act funds were administered by the Federal Works Administration (FWA), but before an application could be approved, it had to be recommended by either the education or welfare department of the local community, the corresponding state agency, the regional FWA office, the Office of Education or Children's Bureau in Washington, and the national FWA office. (Chafe, 1972: 167.)

In essence, confusion, delay and uncertainty characterized the establishment of day care centers during World War II. As Mayo (1943: 129) suggested, "The main difficulty has resulted from the fact that while one federal agency has had most of the funds, the experience necessary for the task of proper financing and supervision of day care projects has resided in other agencies." Accordingly, the primary antagonists were the FWA, a construction agency, and the Federal Security Agency, which housed the Children's Bureau and the Office of Education. Katherine Lenroot, chief of the Children's Bureau, had originally proposed a national day care program to be run by her own agency and the Office of Education. Reversing her original opposition to the creation of day care centers, Lenroot claimed that small communities lacked the facilities and personnel necessary for a large-scale program. The head of the Office of Education, John Studebaker, joined Lenroot in her appeals. "The fact that both officials reversed position when their own proposals were turned down suggested that considerations of power were not irrelevant in the dispute." (Chafe, 1972: 168)

At the heart of the matter was a basic controversy about the role and purpose of a national day care policy. Since the F.W.A. was in the construction business, officials viewed the day care program as a temporary expedient to meet wartime needs. As Gilbert Steiner (1976) suggests, such an attitude reflected a "win-the-war program" instead of a "save-the-children" policy. On the other hand, the Federal Security Agency (F.S.A.) officials emphasized the importance of developing high quality standards for child care. In fact, the F.S.A. viewed day care centers as becoming a permanent fixture in the social welfare arena. (Chafe, 1972) As a compromise solution, the Children's Bureau and the Office of Education were responsible for giving final approval to all proposals for day care. An additional problem was created by the Lanham Act in that family day care homes were not funded because they were not considered "public works." (Greenblatt, 1977: 61; Steinfels, 1973: 67-8)

Amidst all these bureaucratic controversies, a huge number of day care services and nursery school programs were started. By July, 1944, there were over 300,000 children enrolled in over 8,700 child care programs. (Women's Bureau, 1953: 9)

TABLE 2

July, 1944 Utilization Rates
in Child Care Programs*

Number	and Program Type	Child Enrollment
3,102	Day care centers	109,202
2,828	Extended school programs	105,263
1,477	Nursery schools	50,563
835	Centers for school-age children	28,997
516	Combined nursery school and school-aged children program	25,703
8,758	TOTAL	319,728

*Women's Bureau. Handbook of Facts on Women Workers. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1953, 9.

However, these figures may somewhat underestimate the number of children receiving child care because they excluded children at industrial day care centers, family day care homes, and those funded by the Farm Security Administration. (Greenblatt, 1977: 59; Lundberg, 1947: 290) It should also be noted that the term "day care center" was used instead of "day nursery" because school-aged children were included in the various programs. (Morton, 1943: 4) However, approximately 60 percent of the children in day care were preschool children. (Greenblatt, 1977)

The care of school-age children was a welcome addition to the day nursery program. Many teachers and social workers were concerned about the after-school supervision of children aged six to twelve. (Reeder, 1942; Sherman, 1943) "...Teachers in the elementary school were discovering that youngsters often came to school with house keys tied to their necks so that they could let themselves into empty homes after school and sometimes were responsible for the care of even smaller children at that time." (Bragdon, 1943: 10) Hence, public policy focused on the issue of "latch-key children" so that care could be provided and juvenile delinquency prevented.

Industrial Day Care Centers. Historically, social workers and educators had frowned upon the development of industrial day care centers. Such centers were considered to be of low quality because they usually had inadequate space and equipment as well as untrained staff. However, during World War II, an increasing number of industrial day care centers were developed. Both on-site centers were developed as well as those located away from the factory. (Close, 1943)

Perhaps the best known on-site centers were the two established at Kaiser's shipyards in Portland, Oregon. Funding for these centers came from the U.S. Maritime Commission, as well as from the small fees obtained from the mothers. However, the company still had extra costs of operation. But these costs were passed on to the federal government through increased charges on their contracts. (Greenblatt, 1977

Kaiser's day care centers were open 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, and 52 weeks per year; in other words, accessible to mothers working on all three shifts. These centers were professionally staffed,including teachers, nurses, social workers, and nutritionists. Beyond offering child care services, these centers also provided a "take-home" food service for mothers to utilize at the end of their shifts. However, Greenblatt (1977: 60) notes that this additional service was not widely used.

In their 22 months of operation, the two Kaiser day care centers provided care for about 4,000 children. While it was obvious by the utilization rates that these centers were needed, they were still criticized by some social workers. Criticism was aimed at child care services which were operated at night, causing an interrupted sleep schedule for the children. And neighborhood day care centers were favored over those established on the industrial premises. (Greenblatt, 1977)

However, industrial day care centers were the exception rather than the rule during World War II. Most mothers used the Lanham centers instead. Yet problems occurred because these centers were only open from 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. The mother working on the night shift was left with either expensive, or else unacceptable, options. Family day care homes and housekeeper services were expensive whereas foster care in institutions or boarding homes was often unacceptable. Hence, many employers were asked to place mothers of young children on the day shifts. "Invariably the reply is that the employer must be concerned only with competing war contracts and so cannot consider the individual needs of any one group of employees; that it is a war emergency and production is all that counts." (Reeder, 1942: 3) However, some social work agencies established close relations to personnel departments and/or union representatives in an effort to interpret day care needs and dilemmas. (Dashiell, 1944: 15)

While the federal government did not intervene on this particular issue, the War Manpower Commission did establish a special maternity policy for pregnant women. Such women were provided with six weeks pre-delivery leave and eight weeks post-delivery leave without jeopardizing their jobs or seniority privileges. While sex discrimination was not entirely obliterated, policies such as maternity leave at least provided for continuity of employment.

Additional Day Care Legislation During World War II. The debate on a national day care policy did not end with the funding obtained through the Lanham Act. Many day care advocates wanted to establish a permanent legislative authority to provide funds for child care. Hence the Children's Bureau, the social work profession, and the Office of Education supported Senator Elbert Thomas's "War Area Child Care Act" of 1943. (S. 1130) This bill proposed to allocate $20 million on a grant-in-aid basis under the supervision of the F.S.A. (Hopkirk, 1943: 10; Swan, 1970: 6) Once again, the F.S.A. and the F.W.A. were at odds with one another.

> In support of the Thomas Bill, the FSA officials argued that the Lanham Act had been completely ineffective, that it was designed to construct buildings, not care for children, and that Congressman Lanham himself had repeatedly interfered to stop the use of federal funds for child-care projects, especially those administered by welfare agencies. The FWA, on the other hand, claimed that it had already solved the problem. Charging that the Thomas Bill would create confusion and overlapping delay," it implied that what the FSA really sought was federal control over the entire educational process." (Chafe, 1972: 169)

As a result of this bitter debate, President Roosevelt was forced to intervene in the situation. However, since Roosevelt announced that the F.W.A. should revise its procedures, the outcome of the debate was foreshadowed. In the end, the two agencies declared a "truce." And while the Thomas bill received unanimous support in the Senate, the President's actions ruined any chance of passage by the House. In the fall of 1943, Congress enacted an amendment which essentially perpetuated the existing day care program under the Lanham Act. (Chafe, 1972; Swan, 1970)

Thus day care services continued to be operated by the F.W.A. until the end of the war in August, 1945. However, additional funding was provided so that the centers could remain open until October 31, 1945. But, by September 30, federal aid was discontinued in 17 states and Alaska. (Dashiell, June, 1946: 10) Consequently, protests against the termination of funds were expressed to President Truman, members of Congress, and the F.W.A. (Dashiell, June, 1946; Women's Bureau, 1953) In New York, mothers picketed Governor Dewey's residence, and he responded by calling them "Communists." (Greenblatt, 1977: 64)

These protests were lodged because many women planned to continue working, for economic reasons, even though the war was over. Some women were left widows or else had incapacitated husbands. Moreover, an era of economic prosperity followed the war. Combined with a labor shortage, job opportunities for women abounded. (Steinfels, 1973: 69) In fact, Dashiell (June, 1946: 11) stated that the need for day care following the war was far greater than while the war was raging on.

Empirical data on the post-war employment plans of mothers were gathered by Cleveland's "Emergency Child Care Office." (Johnson, 1945) Interviewing 768 mothers with preschool-aged children, it was discovered that 60 percent planned to continue working. Further, 65 percent stated that they wanted or expected to use a day care center. Essentially, mothers liked the day care center because it offered a safe, healthy environment for children as well as educational benefits. Hence, Johnson concluded her article by recommending continued federal funding for child care services.

Despite these protests by day care advocates, as well as empirical studies showing a need for day care, President Truman remained unconvinced. Hence, additional federal funding was provided only until March, 1946. (Dashiell, June, 1946; Women's Bureau, 1953) Such funds allowed mothers to make alternative child care arrangements and provided communities with additional time to obtain state or local funding.

However, few states were prepared to finance the day care centers. The only exceptions were New York, California, Washington and Massachusetts. (Dashiell, October, 1946) The smallest program was in Massachusetts: only four centers were open after the war. In the state of Washington, funds were available from 1945 to 1948 for extended school services. By 1947, the average daily attendance in this program was 1400 children. However, when funds were discontinued in 1948, daily attendance was down to 718. And in New York City alone, there were 104 day care centers caring for 1355 children by 1951. (Women's Bureau, 1953: 17-18) Denver and Detroit each operated five centers through the Welfare Department. Lastly, the state of California funded numerous day care centers which were lauded as cutting welfare costs. "Welfare costs have been reduced by millions of dollars; families that would ordinarily have to go on relief were able to work and support themselves; and veterans with families are able to complete their education while their wives work to supplement family income." (Moustakas and Berson, 1955: 172)

The final legislative attempt during the war years was introduced into Congress by Senator Claude Pepper of Florida. The "Maternal and Child Welfare Act" of 1945 (S. 1318) would provide funds for day care centers as well as foster family day care homes. Not only would children of working mothers be eligible but also those children "whose home conditions require care outside their homes during any part of the

24-hour day." (Dashiell, June, 1946: 11) The program would be jointly administered by the Children's Bureau and the Department of Labor. Unfortunately, this bill died in committee. Representative Clyde Doyle of California introduced a similar measure in the House, but it was also killed in committee.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Addams, Jane. *Twenty Years at Hull House.* New York: MacMillan, 1912.

Anderson, John. "The Infant and Preschool Child," in *White House Conference on Child Health and Protection: Addresses and Abstracts of Committee Reports*. New York: Century Company, 1931a, 153-166.

______________. *Nursery Education: A Survey of Day Nurseries, Nursery Schools and Private Kindergartens in the United States*. New York: Century, 1931b.

______________. *The Young Child in the Home.* New York: Appleton Century, 1936.

Anthony, Katherine. "Mothers Who Must Earn," *The Survey*, XXXII, April 4, 1914, 17-22.

Axinn, June and Levin, Herman. *Social Welfare: A History of the American Response to Need.* New York: Harper & Row, 1975.

Baer, Amelia and East, Jane. "Some Problems of Working Mothers," *The Family*, XXIII, No. 10, February 1943, 386-391.

Baker, Josephine. "Day Nursery Standards," *Standards of Child Welfare: A Report of the Children's Bureau Conferences, 1919.* Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1919, 219-233.

Beer, Ethel. *The Day Nursery*. New York: Dutton, 1938.

__________. "Mental Hygiene Aspects of Day Nurseries," *Mental Hygiene*, XX, No. 1, January, 1936, 41-8.

__________. *Working Mothers and the Day Nursery*. New York: Whiteside, 1957.

Bell, Winnifred. *Aid to Dependent Children*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1965.

Bogue, Mary. "The Social Welfare Program of the Day Nursery," *The Family*, XII, No. 5, July, 1931, 149-156.

Bogue, Mary and Moran, Mary. "Day Nurseries," *Social Work Yearbook, 1929*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1930, 118-119.

____________________________. "Day Nurseries," *Social Work Yearbook, 1933*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1933, 117-119.

Bragdon, Elspeth. "A Day Care Project," in The Impact of War on Children's Services: Nine Monographs. New York: Child Welfare League of America, 1943, 10-12.

Breckinridge, Sophonisba. New Homes for Old. New York: Harper, 1921.

Bremner, Robert (Ed.). Children and Youth in America: A Documentary History. Vol. III: 1933-1973. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1974, 677-720.

Bruno, Frank. Trends in Social Work, 1874-1956: A History Based on the Proceedings of the National Conference on Social Work. New York: Columbia University Press, 1957.

Burgess, M.H. "Day Nursery Work," Proceedings of the National Conference of Charities and Corrections, 1892. Boston: George Ellis, 1892, 424-427.

Butcher, Margaret. "A Foster Day Care Service," Bulletin of the Child Welfare League of America, XXIII, No. 9, November, 1944, 1-4, 12.

Cahn, Frances and Bary, Valeska. Welfare Activities of Federal, State and Local Governments in California, 1850-1934. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1936, 33-37.

Caldwell, Grace. "Standards of Admissions to Day Nurseries," Proceedings of the National Conference of Social Work, 1919. Chicago: Rogers and Hall, 1920, 42-45.

Campbell, Doris. "Counseling Service in the Day Nursery," The Family, XXIV, No. 1, March, 1943, 27-33.

Chafe, William. The American Woman: Her Changing Social, Economic, and Political Role, 1920-1970. London: Oxford, 1972, 162-173.

Chambers, Clarke. Seedtime of Reform: American Social Service and Social Action, 1918-1933. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1963.

Child Welfare League of America. Guide to the Operation of Group Day Care Programs. New York: Child Welfare League of America, 1953.

Children's Bureau. "Care of Infants Whose Mothers are Employed: Policies Recommended by the Children's Bureau," in Bremner, Robert (Ed.), Children and Youth in America: A Documentary History. Vol. III. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 692-694.

Class, Norris. "Public Policy and Working Mothers: A Historical Analysis of the American Experience," in Mothers in Paid Employment. Washington: Day Care and Child Development Council of America, 1974, 53-62.

Close, Kathyrn. "Day Care Up to Now," *Survey Midmonthly*, LXXIX, July, 1943, 194-197.

Colbourne, Frances. "How Good are Day Nurseries?" *The Survey,* LIV, No. 7, July 25, 1925.

________________. "The Day Nursery and the Community," *The Survey*, XXV, No. 4, October 23, 1920, 129-130.

________________. "Too Near to be Seen?" *The Survey*, LI, No. 8, January 15, 1924, 395-396.

Congressional Budget Office. *Child Care and Preschool: Options for Federal Support*. Washington: Congressional Budget Office, September, 1978.

Conway, Jill. "Women Reformers and American Culture, 1870-1930," *Journal of Social History*, V, No. 2, Winter, 1972, 164-177.

"Counseling Service in a Day Care Program," *CWLA Bulletin*, XXI, No. 8, October, 1942, 11.

Cremin, Lawrence. *The Transformation of the School: Progressivism and American Education, 1876-1957*. New York: Alfred Knopf, 1969.

Crowe, Brenda. *The Playgroup Movement*. New York: Schocken Books, 1973.

Dashiell, Alice. "The Children in Day Time Care," *CWLA Bulletin*, XXIII, No. 10, December, 1944, 5-7, 15-16.

______________. "The Dilemma of Day Care," *CWLA Bulletin*, XXV, No. 8, October, 1946, 14-15.

______________. "National Trends in Day Care," *CWLA Bulletin*, XXV, No. 6, June, 1946, 10-11.

______________. "Notes on 'Central Intake Bureau of a Day Care Program,'" *CWLA Bulletin*, XXII, No. 5, May, 1943, 14.

______________. "Parents' Payments for Day Care Services--The Use of the Sliding Scale of Fees," *CWLA Bulletin,* XXII, No. 6a, September, 1943c, 4-5.

______________. "The Union of Two Professions in the Field of Day Care," *CWLA Bulletin*, XXII, No. 4, April, 1943a, 8-9.

Dashiell, Alice and Keeley, Mary. "Day Care, A Review of Organization and Administration," *CWLA Bulletin*, XXIII, No. 4, April, 1944, 1-3.

____________________________. "Day Care: Suggestions for Developing Services," *CWLA Bulletin*, XXIII, No. 5, May, 1944, 1-4, 13.

Davis, Allen. Spearheads for Reform: The Social Settlements and the Progressive Movement, 1890-1914. New York: Oxford University Press, 1967.

Davis, Mary D. "Preschool Children," Social Work Yearbook, 1935. New York: Russell Sage Foundation. 1935, 333-6.

Dewey, Mary. "The Scope of Day Nursery Work," in Proceedings of the National Conference of Charities and Corrections, 1897. Boston: George Ellis, 1898, 105-107.

Devine, Edward. "Day Nursery," Charities Review, X, August, 1900, 263-265.

_______________. Principles of Relief. London: MacMillan, 1910.

Dodge, Mrs. Arthur. "Neighborhood Work and the Day Nursery," Proceedings of the National Conference of Charities and Corrections, 1912. Fort Wayne, Indiana: Fort Wayne Printing Company, 1912, 113-118.

Doyle, Michael. "Remarks," in Proceedings of hee Conference on the Care of Dependent Children. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1909, 115-116.

Farnum, Dorothy. "Casework in the Modern Day Nursery," CWLA Bulletin, XXIII, No. 7, September, 1944, 1-4, 12-13.

Flater, Ruth. "Day Care of Children of Working Mothers," CWLA Bulletin, XXII, No. 7, October, 1943, 7, 9-11.

Flexner, Abraham. "Is Social Work a Profession?" in Pumphrey, Ralph and Pumphrey, Muriel (Eds.). The Heritage of American Social Work. New York: Columbia, 1961, 301-307.

Flexner, Eleanor. Century of Struggle: The Woman's Rights Movement in the United States. (Rev. Ed.). Cambridge, Massachusetts: Belknap Press, 1975.

Forest, Ilse. Preschool Education: A Historical and Critical Study. New York: MacMillan, 1927.

Fraiberg, Selma. Every Child's Birthright: In Defense of Mothering. New York: Basic Books, 1977.

Fredrickson, Hazel. "The Program for Day Care of Employed Mothers," Social Service Review, XVII, No. 2, June, 1943, 159-169.

Germain, Carel. "Casework and Science: A Historical Encounter," in Roberts, Robert and Nee, Robert (Eds.), Theories of Social Casework. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970, 3-32.

Gesell, Arnold. "Individual Versus Group Care of Infants," CWLA Bulletin, XXIII, No. 7, September, 1944, 9-10.

__________. The Preschool Child From the Standpoint of Public Hygiene and Education. Boston: Houghton, 1923.

Gillam, Mabel. "A New Interpretation of the Task of Day Nurseries," Proceedings of the National Conference of Social Work, 1921. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1921, 109-111.

Gillin, John. Poverty and Dependency: Their Relief and Prevention. New York: Century Company, 1925.

Goldsmith, Cornelia. Better Day Care for the Young Child. Washington: National Association for the Education of Young Children, 1972.

Goodykoontz, Bess, Davis, Mary, and Gabbard, Hazel. "Recent History and Present Status of Education for Young Children," in Nelson, Henry (Ed.). The Forty-sixth Yearbook of the Society for the Study of Education, Part II: Early Childhood Education. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1947, 44-69.

Gordon, Henrietta. Casework Services for Children. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1956.

__________. "Save the Home to Save the Child--An All-Time Slogan," CWLA Bulletin, XXI, No. 6, June, 1942, 6-7.

Greenblatt, Bernard. Responsibility for Child Care. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977, 15-78.

Greene, Florence H. "Prevention of Infant Mortality," in Weeks, Mary H. (Ed.), Parents and Their Problems, Vol. II. Washington: National Congress of Mothers and Parent-Teachers Associations, 1914, 40-52.

Guyler, Cathryn. "Social Work Responsibility for the Development of Day Care," Proceedings of the National Conference of Social Work, 1942. New York: Columbia University, 1942, 440-450.

Hansen, Barbara. "A Caseworker Speaks to the Public Use of Day Care," CWLA Bulletin, XXII, No. 9, December, 1943, 16-17.

Hedger, Caroline. "Standards of Hygiene and Equipment of Day Nurseries," Proceedings of the National Conference of Social Work, 1919. Chicago: Rogers & Hall, 1920, 45-48.

Hengst, Fanny. "Casework Services in Day Nursery Care," *CWLA Bulletin*, XXII, No. 9, December, 1943, 6-7, 14.

Hirsch, Emil. "The Home Versus the Institution," *Proceedings of the Conference on the Care of Dependent Children*, 1909. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1909, 85-94.

Holden, Arthur. *The Settlement Idea: A Vision of Social Justice.* New York: MacMillan Company, 1922.

Hopkirk, Howard. "Is More Day Care Needed?" *CWLA Bulletin*, XXI, No. 5, May, 1942a, 6-7.

______________. "The Senate Considers Day Care Needs," *CLWA Bulletin*, XXII, No. 6, June, 1943, 10-11.

______________. "The League and Day Care," *CWLA Bulletin*, XXI, No. 8, October, 1942b, 8.

Hosley, Eleanor. "Is Day Care the Answer?" *CWLA Bulletin*, XXII, No. 3, March, 1943, 1-3, 11.

Hughes, Gwendolyn. *Mothers in Industry*. New York: New Republic Publishing Company, 1925.

Ijams, Margaret. "Day Nurseries Turn to the League," *CWLA Bulletin*, No. 9, November, 1942, 8.

Jensen, Kai. "Preschool Education," *Encyclopedia of Educational Research*. New York: MacMillan, 1950, 856-864.

Johnson, Glenna. "Counseling Service in Emergency Day Care," *CWLA Bulletin*, XXII, No. 9, December, 1943, 4-5, 12-14.

______________. "Will Mothers Go on Working?" *CWLA Bulletin*, XXIV, No. 1, January, 1945, 1-3, 14-15.

Johnston, Rosa. "The Case Worker in Foster Families for Day Care," *Proceedings of the National Conference on Social Work, 1944*. New York: Columbia University, 1944, 246-255.

Kadushin, Alfred. *Child Welfare Services*. New York: Macmillan, 1973.

Keiser, Laura. "The Development of Specialized Service in Response to Community Needs," *The Family*, XIX, No. 10, February, 1939, 315-318.

____________. "Whom Can the Day Nursery Serve?" *The Family*, XVII, No. 7, November, 1936, 226-230.

Kelley, Edwina. "Uncle Sam's Nursery Schools," in Bremner, Robert, (Ed.). Children and Youth in America: A Documentary History, Vol. III. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1974, 679-681.

Kenney, Luna. "Foster Day Care," The Survey, LXIX, No. 1, January, 1933, 44-45.

____________. "How Day Care Differs," CWLA Bulletin, XV, No. 8, October, 1936, 3, 5-6.

La Grange, Helen. "An Experiment in Day Time Foster Home Care for Children," CWLA Bulletin, VIII, No. 2, February, 1929, 4-5.

______________. "The First Day Nursery Experiment," CWLA Bulletin, IX, No. 1, January, 1930, 6-7.

______________. "The First Day Nursery Experiment," CWLA Bulletin, February, 1930, 2-3.

Langdon, Grace. "The Program of the WPA in the U.S. Children's Bureau," in Bremner, Robert (Ed.). Children and Youth in America: A Documentary History, Vol. III. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1974, 681-684.

Lasch, Christopher (Ed.). The Social Thought of Jane Addams. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1965.

"The League Advances its Day Care Plans," CWLA Bulletin, XXII, No. 1, January, 1943, 14.

Leiby, James . A History of Social Welfare and Social Work in the United States. New York: Columbia University Press, 1978.

Lockwood, Anita. "Day-Time and Night-Time Parents," CWLA Bulletin, XVI, No. 1, January, 1937, 2.

Lubove, Roy. The Professional Altruist: The Emergence of Social Work as a Career, 1880-1930. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1965.

Lundberg, Emma. "Child Welfare Services," Social Work Yearbook, 1939. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1939, 63-75.

____________. Unto the Least of These: Social Services for Children. New York: Appleton-Century, 1947.

Mayo, Leonard. "Resolutions on Child Welfare Policies in Wartime," CWLA Bulletin, XXII, No. 1, January, 1943, 8-9.

____________. "What We Can Learn from National Experience in Day Care," Proceedings of the National Conference of Social Work, 1943. New York: Columbia University Press, 1943, 126-139.

McCormick, Elizabeth. "Interviewing Mothers in Industry," CWLA Bulletin, XXII, No. 6, June, 1943, 7.

McElroy, Ruth. "Wartime Need for Day Care of Children," The Family, XXIII, No. 4, June, 1942, 123-129.

McMillan, Margaret. The Nursery School. London: J.M. Dent & Sons, 1919.

Meek, Lois. "Day Nurseries Today," CWLA Bulletin, XIV, No. 6, June, 1935, 1-2, 7-8.

__________. "Nursery Schools," Social Work Yearbook, 1929. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1930, 291-293.

__________. "Nursery Schools," Social Work Yearbook, 1933. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1933, 321-323.

__________. "Preschool Children," Social Work Yearbook, 1937. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1937, 344-348.

Melby, Dorothy. "Casework Service in a Day Nursery," CWLA Bulletin, XXI, No. 4, April, 1942, 35-38.

Miller, Wayne C. A Comprehensive Bibliography for the Study of American Minorities, Vol. III. New York: New York University Press, 1976.

Moran, Mary. "Day Nurseries," Social Work Yearbook, 1937. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1937, 117-118.

Morgan, Gwen. "Federal Day Care Standards and the Law," Paper prepared for the FIDCR Appropriateness Study, October 15, 1976.

Morton, Dorothy. "Planning with Mothers for the Care of Their Children," CWLA Bulletin, XXII, No. 6, June, 1943, 4-6, 20.

Moskowitz, Henry. "The Place of the Immigrant Child in the Social Program," in Breckinridge, Soponisba (Ed.), The Child in the City. Chicago: Department of Social Investigation, Chicago School of Civics and Philanthropy, 1912, 257-259.

Moustakas, Clark and Berson, Minnie. The Nursery School and Child Care Center. New York: Whiteside, Inc., 1955.

Murphy, Irene. "Detroit's Experience with the Wartime Care of Children," Proceedings of the National Conference on Social Work, 1943. New York: Columbia University Press, 1943, 133-139.

National Advisory Committee on Emergency Nursery Schools. *Emergency Nursery Schools During the First Year, 1933-34*. Washington, D.C.: Works Progress Administration, 1938.

National Association for Nursery Education. *Essentials of Nursery Education*. Washington: National Association for Nursery Education, 1935.

"Nurseries Count the Cost," *The Survey*, LXVII, No. 6, December 15, 1931, 314.

"Nurseries in a Changing World," *The Survey*, LXVII, No. 10, February 15, 1932, 538.

O'Neill, William (Ed.). *The Woman Movement: Feminism in the United States and England.* Chicago: Quadrangle, 1969, 1-100.

Pearson, Gerald. "Cooperation Between the Day Nursery Worker and the Psychiatrist," *The Family*, XXII, No. 9, January, 1942, 309-314.

Phelps, Katherine, McVeigh, Wilma, Fahey, Madeline. "Is Physical Care Enough?" *CWLA Bulletin*, XXII, No. 7, October, 1943, 1-4.

Pidgeon, Mary Elizabeth. "Employed Mothers and Child Care," in Bremner, Robert (Ed.). *Children and Youth in America: A Documentary History*, Vol. III. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1974, 677-678.

Pumphrey, Ralph and Pumphrey, Muriel (Eds.), *The Heritage of American Social Work.* New York: Columbia, 1961.

Pyke, Emma. "Meeting Clients' Needs Through Nursery Care," *CWLA Bulletin,* XV, No. 9, November, 1936, 1, 4-6.

Rademacher, Everett. "The Psychiatrist Looks at the Day Nursery," *CWLA Bulletin,* XVI, No. 3, March, 1937, 3, 7.

Rawley, Callman. "Casework or Counseling in the Day Nursery?" *Proceedings of the National Conference of Social Work, 1943.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1943, 237-240.

Reeder, Grace. "Community Planning for the Care of Children of Employed Mothers," *CWLA Bulletin*, XXI, No. 7, September, 1942, 1-3, 9-10.

Ribble, Margaret. "Infant Care and Emotional Growth," *CWLA Bulletin,* XXIII, No. 8, October, 1944, 1-3.

Richmond, Mary. Social Diagnosis. New York: Russell Sage, 1917.

______________. What is Social Casework? New York: Russell Sage, 1922.

Robinson, Virginia. "Emerging Awareness of Relationship," in Pumphrey, Ralph and Pumphrey, Muriel (Eds.). The Heritage of American Social Work. New York: Columbia, 1961, 355-360.

Rosenau, Nathan. "Day Nurseries," Proceedings of the National Conference of Charities and Corrections, 1894. Boston: George Ellis, 1894, 333-340.

______________. "Schemes for the Self-Help of the Poor: The Fitch Creche and the Labor Bureau of the Charity Organization Society of Buffalo," Proceedings of the National Conference of Charities and Corrections, 1886. Boston: George Ellis, 1886, 176-184.

Ross, Elizabeth Dale. The Kindergarten Crusade: The Establishment of Preschool Education in the United States. Athens, Ohio: Ohio University Press, 1976.

Rothman, Sheila. Woman's Proper Place: A History of Changing Ideals and Practices, 1870 to the Present. New York: Basic Books, 1978.

ousmaniere, John. "Cultural Hybrid in the Slums: The College Woman and the Settlement House, 1889-1894," American Quarterly, XXII, No. 1, Spring, 1970, 45-66.

Ruderman, Florence. Child Care and Working Mothers. New York: Child Welfare League of America, 1968.

Ruegg, Rene. "Day Care Program for Children in Philadelphia," CWLA Bulletin, XXII, No. 2, February, 1943, 5-7.

______________. "Why Casework is Needed in Day Care for Children in this Emergency," CWLA Bulletin, XXI, No. 1, January, 1942, 8.

Saia, George. "Day Care at Home and Abroad: The Policy Issues," Unpublished Substantive Paper, Heller School, Brandeis University, December, 1975.

Sawyer, Mildred. "Studying Day Nursery Intake," CWLA Bulletin, XVI, No. 5, May, 1937, 3, 6-7.

Scanlan, Michael. "Remarks." Proceedings of the Conference on the Care of Dependent Children. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1909, 41-43.

Sheldon, Eleanor. "Casework Service in a Day Nursery," *CWLA Bulletin.* XXI, No. 9, November, 1942, 5, 10-11.

Sherman, Doris. "Central Intake Bureau of a Day Care Program," *CWLA Bulletin*, XXII, No. 5, May, 1943, 5-7.

Shyne, Ann and Schroeder, Anita. *National Study of Social Services to Children and Their Families.* Washington: National Center for Child Advocacy, 1978.

Silverman, Anne. "Casework with Day Nursery Clients," *The Family,* XXV, No. 3, May, 1944, 95-102.

Smith, Flora. "Day Nurseries in Los Angeles," *CWLA Bulletin,* XV, No. 4, April, 1936, 3, 7.

Snay, Mitchell. "Limits to Fellowship: Denison House and Working Women in Boston, 1890-1925." Unpublished paper, History Department, Brandeis University, February, 1977.

Solomon, Helen. "A Mother's and Children's Building," *The Survey,* XXV, No. 12, December, 17, 1910.

Steiner, Gilbert. *The Children's Cause*. Washington: Brookings Institution, 1976.

Steinfels, Margaret. *Who's Minding the Children? The History and Politics of Day Care in America.* New York: Simon and Schuster, 1973.

Sunley, Robert. "Early Nineteenth Century Literature on Child Rearing," in Mead, Margaret and Wolfenstein, Martha (Eds.). *Childhood in Contemporary Cultures.* Chicago: University of Chicago, 1955, 150-167.

Swan, Raymond. *The Federal Government and Day Care Since 1940.* Unpublished manuscript, School of Social Work, University of Southern California, 1970.

Trattner, Walter. *From Poor Law to Welfare State: A History of Social Welfare in America*. New York: Free Press, 1974.

Tyson, Helen. "Day Nurseries," *Social Work Yearbook, 1935*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1935, 107-109.

____________. "Day Nursery," *Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences,* Vol. V. New York: MacMillan Company, 1938, 13-16.

____________. "Mothers Who Earn," *The Survey*, LVII, No. 5, December 1, 1926, 275-279.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. Historical Statistics of the United States: Colonial Times to 1970. Washington: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1975.

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Regulatory Analysis: Proposed H.E.W. Day Care Requirements. Washington: Office of the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, June, 1979.

Voiland, Alice. "Casework in a Day Nursery," The Family, XXIII, No. 3, May, 1942, 97-102.

Wald, Lillian. "Qualifications and Training for Service with Children in a Crowded City Neighborhood," in Breckinridge, Sophonisba (Ed.). The Child in the City. Chicago: Department of Social Investigation, Chicago School of Civics and Philanthropy, 1912, 244-256.

Warner, Amos, Queen, Stuart, and Harper, Ernest. American Charities and Social Work, Fourth Edition. New York: Thomas Crowell, 1930.

Washington, Forrester. "What Professional Training Means to the Social Worker," Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, CXI, September, 1925, 165-9.

Weeks, Mary. "What Constitutes a Good Mother," in Weeks, Mary (Ed.). Parents and Their Problems, Vol. I. Washington: National Congress of Mothers and Parent-Teachers Associations, 1914, 195-203.

"Welcome Day Nurseries!" CWLA Bulletin, XV, No. 1, January, 1936, 4.

"What is a Nursery Child Made Of?" The Survey, LXVI, No. 2, April 15, 1931, 96-97.

Whipple, Guy M. (Ed.). "Day Nurseries," in Twenty-eighth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Bloomington, Illinois: Public School Publishing Company, 1929, 87-106.

Williamson, Margaretta. The Social Worker in Child Care and Protection. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1931.

Winslow, Mary. "Married Women in Industry," Proceedings of the National Conference of Social Work, 1923. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1923, 321-326.

Women's Bureau. Handbook of Facts on Women Workers. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1953.

Woods, Robert and Kennedy, Albert. The Settlement Horizon. New York: Russell Sage, 1922.

Worthington, Dorothy. "Mushroom Day Nurseries Checked," The Survey, XLI, No. 8, November 23, 1918, 229-230.